

Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

LONDON, MAY 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS:—

The Clerks of Records and Writs	521
Mr. Watkin Williams, Q.C., on Reforms in Legal Procedure.....	521
Extradition of Regicides	521
Occasional Licenses	522
The New Legal Offices	522
The Chancery Cause List	523
Sir Walter Trevelyan's Bequest	523
The Charity Commission	523

LEADERS:—

The Use and Abuse of Cross-Examination	523
The Rule in Sibley v. Perry	524
Executors Charging Commission on Assets Collected in India.....	525
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.....	526
CASES OF THE WEEK	527
SOCIETIES.....	528
ORBITANTS.....	531
APPOINTMENTS, ETC.....	531
LEGAL NEWS.....	531
The Land Titles and Transfer Committee.....	532
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.....	532
COURT PAPERS	533
LONDON GAZETTE, &c., &c.	533

NOTES OF CASES.

Rosevear Clay Company, Ex parte The	527
Blake, Ex parte	527
West Cumberland Iron and Steel Company, The, v. Kenyon	527
Malph v. Gerrick	528
Crumlin v. Duclux Works Company, Re	528
Sockett's Estate, Re	528
Powell v. Head	529
West of England, &c., Bank, In re The	529
Dardier v. Chapman.....	529

REPORTS.

Allen's Trusts, In re (Ch.Div. Fry, J., sitting for V.C.M.)	529
Astrop, Ex parte. In re Leleuvre (App.)	518
Cosper, Ex parte. In re McLaren (App.)	518
Coyle v. Cumming (Ch.Div. Fry, J., sitting for V.C.M.)	519
Duncan, Fox, & Co. v. The North and South Wales Bank (App.)..	511
Girdlestone v. The Brighton Aquarium Company (App.).....	510
Grayson's Trusts, In re (Ch.Div. Fry, J., sitting for V.C.M.)	534
Harrison v. Wearings (Ch.Div. M.R.)	526
Hough & Co. v. Mansnos & Co. (Ex.Div.)	536
Luke v. South Kensington Hotel Company (App.)	514
McPhail v. Lowden (Ch.Div. M.R.)	525
Mulkers and others v. Lord (H.L.)	510
Patey v. Flint and another (Ch.Div. Fry, J., sitting for V.C.M.)....	529
Pullen v. Snellus (C.P.Div.)	534
Republic of Costa Rica v. Strouberg (App.)	512
Richards & Co., In re (Ch.Div. Fry, J., sitting for V.C.M.).....	530
Ridley (deceased), In re. Buckton v. Hay (Ch.Div. M.R.).....	527
Sharp v. Lush (Ch.Div. M.R.)	528
Smith v. Woolston (C.P.Div.)	535
Stewart v. Gladstone (App.)	512

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that arrangements have been made for obviating some of the objections which have been raised to the rooms appropriated in the "Royal Courts of Justice" to the Clerks of Records and Writs; and it may be anticipated that this office will shortly be removed to the new building.

THE LETTER from Mr. Watkin Williams, Q.C., M.P., which appears in another column contains proposals well worthy of consideration. His first proposition is to abolish all *ex parte* applications for new trials, and to require that notice of motion should be given in every case. His main argument is that it "would expedite the final end of the litigation, and tend to diminish expense." Whether it would tend to expedite the final

end of litigation depends, of course, on the assumption that motions on notice for a new trial would, on the average, be more quickly disposed of than the hearing of rules granted and rules refused taken together, after deducting the cases where rules are applied for merely in the hope of getting, on an *ex parte* statement, a rule which will be ultimately discharged, but which, in the meantime, will have delayed the realization by the other party of the fruits of his success. Before this calculation can be made, it must be ascertained what system is to take the place of the present one. Will the whole of what is known as the new trial paper be advanced, or will the motions for new trials be postponed? It is well known, and is an element in the complaint, that rules for new trials come slowly to a hearing, and it is, at the same time, true that they form a large and very important branch of business. Now, if the contents of this paper are to be advanced, the position of other business will be much disturbed. If, on the other hand, the motions for new trials are to be deferred, then it will be not less but more easy, by giving notice of motion, to delay your opponent. It is assumed that the new trial paper is now swollen with cases which would never come before the court but for the practice of granting *ex parte* rules; but unless all new trial motions were heard with a speed somewhat resembling that with which *ex parte* motions are now disposed of, the new trial paper would be swollen with notices of motion tempted by the prospect, not of a possible, but a certain, delay. While, therefore, much that is urged by Mr. Williams is forcible and true, the conclusion which he founds upon it seems not to have been quite adequately considered; and we are not prepared to advocate the change which he proposes without seeing our way more clearly to the realization of the end he has in view. In truth, however, it must be said that we have little faith in any scheme for the convenient adjustment of business so long as the present system of divisional courts continues. If once the principle could be really established and carried out that, beyond the single judge, there should be no appeal except to the Court of Appeal, a conclusion would be reached to which all such proposals as we are considering are really only stepping-stones, that might as well be briskly passed at once. That such a step would not cure all the ills of delay, common sense will easily enough tell us; but there is one delay at least which it would cure—the delay of waiting for it. Upon the other topic referred to in Mr. Williams' letter we agree generally with him, but must defer our remarks.

THE RECENT ATTEMPT upon the life of the Russian Emperor, following as it does similar attempts upon the Emperor of Germany and the King of Italy, and upon several assassinations and attempted assassinations of Russian officials, has revived the question how regicides and other political assassins should be dealt with when they escape into a foreign country. The extradition treaties entered into between continental States, especially those entered into by France, and more recently by Russia, have usually provided that the exclusion of political offences from extradition should not extend to attempts to murder the Sovereign or any member of his family. On the other hand, the English Extradition Act of 1870 prohibits extradition "for any offence of a political character"—words which a court of law can hardly fail to construe as including assassinations for political reasons, though, having regard to the debate of 1865 and the proceedings of the Select Committee of 1868, it may be doubtful whether this was what was intended. The *Agence Russe* has recently published an article upon regicide from the point of view of international law, which appears, according to the summary we have seen, to propose, not the extradition of regicides, but rather that a special tribunal should be constituted for the trial of all regicides who have escaped into another country. We assume that the handing

over of an offender to be tried by this international tribunal would require the same formalities and safeguards as are now required in other cases of extradition. This proposal would, no doubt, to some extent get rid of the most serious objection to the extradition of political assassins—viz., the uncertainty whether they would have a fair trial in the foreign country. But the whole plan of an international tribunal seems to us beset with most serious difficulties; and we do not see why, if such tribunal should be constituted at all, it should be confined to regicides, to the exclusion of other political assassins.

SOME AMUSEMENT was excited in the House of Commons a few days ago by Sir Wilfrid Lawson's account of certain justices of the peace at Aberystwyth granting an occasional licence to their own host. As everybody concerned, except the holder of the licence, was stated to be "very sorry," it was announced that no further notice would be taken of the matter, but it may be desirable to point out that the Legislature has taken precautions against such an event. The "occasional licence," by the 29th section of the Licensing Act, 1872, may be granted by the local authority if in its discretion it thinks fit to do so, and when granted exempts the applicant from the provisions of the Licensing Acts "relating to the closing of premises during certain hours, and on the special occasion or occasions to be specified in the licence." By the 20th section of the same Act the "local authority" is, except in the metropolis, "two justices of the peace in petty sessions assembled." Now, by 12 & 13 Vict. c. 18, s. 2, it is provided that in all cases where there shall not be "any fit or proper place" for holding petty sessions, the justices may hire such a place from time to time, but no direction may be given for hiring any such place without certain formalities, amongst which public advertisement is one. The Municipal Corporation Act, 1835 (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 76, s. 100), is still more precise, for after directing that the town council shall provide "one or more fit and suitable office or offices to be called the police-office, for the purpose of transacting the business of the justices of the borough," it enacts that "no room in any house licensed as a victualling-house or alehouse, shall be used for the purposes of any such police-office." It would appear, therefore, that the Aberystwyth occasional licence was bad, and not only was the licence-holder liable to penalties, but also the justices themselves were (under the 25th section of the Licensing Act, 1872) for being on licensed premises during closing hours. This latter penalty, however, only seems to attach upon the party being "found" on the licensed premises.

BY THE CONCENTRATION of the offices in the "Royal Courts of Justice" a considerable saving should be effected in the item of office-keepers and care-takers. Many of these officials enjoyed salaries which were supplemented by the use of apartments and the right to a supply of coals, &c., and, so far as can be ascertained, the charges for office-keepers and care-takers for the offices at present occupying, or about to occupy, the new building are as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Queen's Bench Masters	150	0	0
Common Pleas Masters			
Exchequer Masters			
Masters in Lunacy	120	0	0
Visitors in Lunacy	40	0	0
Registrar in Lunacy	21	0	0
Chancery Registrars	384	13	4
Chancery Taxing Masters	200	0	0
Record and Writ Clerks	180	0	0
Report Office			
Chancery Paymaster	60	0	0
	£1,155	13	4

It will seem that, after providing on a liberal scale for a housekeeper or superintendent and the ten or twelve servants at present necessary for the care of the new building, a considerable margin will remain, and as it is not intended that any one shall reside in the building, the greater part of the allowances of coals, &c., heretofore made to resident care-takers, will be saved. At the present time there appears to be no one in charge of the new building, and the divided authority of the officers of the Board of Works and their carpenters, and of the several heads of departments, adds considerably to the confusion incident to the removal of extensive establishments. It is much to be regretted that one of the official referees, or some other personage with equal leisure on his hands, has not been requested to act as housekeeper *pro tem*.

NOTWITHSTANDING THE COMPLAINTS that business is falling off, the Chancery Cause Lists for the Easter sittings show no great variation from the corresponding lists of last year. The Master of the Rolls has 59 causes with witnesses, and 22 without; last Easter he had 33 with witnesses and 35 without. Vice-Chancellor Malins has only 14 causes, but Mr. Justice Fry has 136, making a total of 150; last year Vice-Chancellor Malins had 119, and Mr. Justice Fry 63, being a total of 182. Vice-Chancellor Bacon has 40 causes, against 22 last year, and Vice-Chancellor Hall has 63, as against 79 last year. Altogether the five chancery courts of first instance have 334 causes, as against 351 in Easter, 1878; but the fact must not be lost sight of that, in consequence of the offices being closed for several days this Easter by reason of their removal, a large number of causes were delayed in setting down; and it is understood that the number set down during the first three days after the opening of the offices would, if they had been set down during the Easter recess, have swelled the lists considerably beyond those of last year. The Court of Appeal has 214 appeals, as against 144 in Easter, 1878. Of these, it appears that 80 are appeals from the Chancery Division, 96 from the three common law divisions combined, 9 from the Probate and Admiralty Division, and 29 bankruptcy appeals.

UNTIL THE TERMS of the bequest in Sir Walter Trevelyan's will of his wines to Dr. Richardson are made public, there is little advantage in speculating on the mode in which the learned and abstinent legatee should deal with his legacy. But it seems right at once to warn him against adopting the advice given this week by a correspondent of the *Times*, who, assuming that the bequest creates a trust, suggests that, instead of either selling the wine, and thus distributing poison and encouraging vice; or wasting the wine, and thus committing a breach of trust, he "might drink the wine and keep a scientific record of the results." Though the consequences to the trustee of this mode of dealing with the trust estate have not yet, we believe, been developed by decision, there can be little doubt that the court (which, as Lord Justice Turner said in *Pennell v. Deffell*, 4 De G. M. & G. 389, has felt bound to grapple with the greatest difficulties for the purpose of carrying out the doctrine of following trust property) would find some means of getting at the learned doctor into whom the trust estate would be traced. And so many embarrassing questions would arise as to whether it was a case of other property having been substituted for the trust property, or of the trustee having mixed the trust property with his own property, that we cannot help exploring Dr. Richardson not to swallow the trust estate.

WE ARE GLAD TO OBSERVE, from Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson's speech last week, that it is proposed to impose a scale of fees on orders obtained from the

Charity Commissioners. Under the Charitable Trusts Act, 1860, the commissioners are empowered to make such orders as may be made "by any judge of the Court of Chancery sitting at chambers, or by any county court or district court of bankruptcy . . . for or relating to the assurance, transfer, or payment of any real or personal estate" belonging to a charity, or for the establishment of a scheme. This jurisdiction, we believe, is frequently resorted to for the purpose of obtaining the appointment of new trustees of dissenting chapels, and the vesting of the trust property in them; and thus a result which was formerly invariably accomplished by a deed costing a considerable sum, is now obtained at no more expense than the stamp on the vesting order. The officials who have charge of this branch of the commissioners' work are very efficient and obliging; a professional adviser is not indispensable; and thus the State provides gratuitous legal assistance and judicial services for bodies who are perfectly well able to pay for such assistance and services. In such cases as these somewhat heavy fees should be imposed.

THE USE AND ABUSE OF CROSS-EXAMINATION.

It has rarely happened of late years that a case of the class known as "sensational" has occurred, not excepting the so-called case of the "Richmond Murder," without calling forth comments in the public press on the mode in which the cross-examination of witnesses has been conducted. It must be allowed that these strictures are not always without reason. The charges against cross-examining counsel are, indeed, of very old date, and since Pickwick they have been a commonplace for every mouth. But in the old savage period of the criminal law much was justified that has now no excuse. Where slight offences against property were sought to be repressed by the extreme penalty, to baffle and confuse, even by violence and browbeating, the witnesses who were to establish the charge, might seem a commendable, almost a holy office; and, besides, the rougher manners which prevailed allowed much to pass without observation that would offend our times. In those days, however, if the manners were rough, and the morals not over scrupulous, it cannot be doubted that skill and dexterity in the use of this formidable weapon was greater, and led to an economy in its use far different from the lavish and prodigal expenditure which the trials of our own day, and above all the great *Tichborne case*, have exhibited. On the other hand, it will be apparent to those who are acquainted with the subject that the comments of the public are often far astray; that the drift of the questions put is misunderstood, and that questions are complained of which the judge could not reasonably exclude, and which counsel could not be blamed for putting.

It may be observed that there are four principal objects in cross-examination. First, it may be used as the means of proving the case of the examining counsel's client out of the mouth of his adversary's witnesses; or, where so much as this cannot be done, of exhibiting that case in such a way as to break the effect and pressure of evidence which would otherwise have a uniformly adverse appearance, and at once possessing the minds of the hearers of the fact that there is another and very different story, and, perhaps, a more probable and consistent one, to be told. To use it adroitly for this purpose is a work of the highest skill. In days when counsel for prisoners could only be heard to cross-examine witnesses, but not to address the jury, it was *par excellence* the advocate's art; and it was doubtless in this school, and under those who had practised in it, that counsel were formerly trained to that ingenuity which so highly distinguished many of a former generation, and a few even of our own time.

A second object is to show, by an examination into a

witness's means of knowledge and the sources of his information, by comparing his statements with one another or with others made by him elsewhere, or by confronting him with facts which he can neither deny nor explain, that his evidence is either inadmissible, or, if admissible, is inaccurate, confused, contradictory, and untrustworthy. The play is here less elegant, but more subtle; indeed so subtle that it perhaps as often entangles the feet of the counsel who uses it as of the witness on whom it is practised. When skilfully conducted it is most interesting to witness; but its successful practice needs a combination of readiness and judgment not often to be found; it will be well if it escapes blunders; it will be better still if it rises above a smart shrewdness.

A third object is to detect and display some motive or interest in the witness tending to warp and prejudice his testimony, and to induce him either to invent the matter of his statement, or to distort and garble his story. Like the two methods above mentioned, this mode of cross-examination also admits of high excellence. It calls often for the exercise of great penetration and sagacity; but it may, on the other hand, be, and often is, resorted to as a coarse and ready weapon, which can be snatched up when all other resources fail, or in place of arts which are wanting. A vulgar and unscrupulous advocate may perhaps be known more easily by his freedom in resorting to this weapon than by any other test; but it is sometimes only the despair of inexperience which brings it into use.

In the fourth place, cross-examination may aim at damaging the character of the witness, in matters not relating to the cause, and therefore by questions which are not relevant to the issue in any other sense than as they are relevant to the witness, but which by disclosing some past misdeeds tend to show him to be unworthy of credit. It is this line of cross-examination which most often calls down the censure of the public; it is the rudest engine of attack; the liability to it is sometimes used to deter the witness from giving evidence, and it seems sometimes resorted to as a mere instrument of revenge. It need not be said that such a practice is altogether illegitimate, and merits the severest condemnation; and it may, perhaps, be that if the distinction between this use of it and its genuine and proper purpose were borne in mind by tribunals, something might be done towards curbing the licence of cross-examination. But it must be confessed that the line is hard for any one but the cross-examining counsel himself to draw; and that the matter must chiefly be left to his honour and discretion. But liable as the practice is to abuse by those who either err by ignorance, or who are reckless of everything but notoriety and sensation, and greatly as it needs the check of authority, it is too important a weapon of discovery to be discarded. What it discovers indeed is not the facts immediately relating to the case. But the facts relating to the career of a witness may, and often have been such, especially in political cases, as to justify the jury in disregarding evidence proceeding from such a source, and to show the necessity of holding such a weapon in reserve. But it should be held in reserve; and it should be a maxim enforced by the bench and accepted as a rule by every advocate, that to assail the character of a witness revengefully, recklessly, or wantonly, or for any other purpose or with any other hope than that of discrediting his testimony, is not only a crime against good feeling and good taste, but is an abuse of privileges which are granted to him for quite different ends and purposes.

It is stated that the number of law students admitted on call day to the Irish bar was unusually large. The list contains fifteen names more than has been the average number called in any term for a very long time, and with two exceptions all the new barristers are graduates of a university.

THE RULE IN *SIBLEY v. PERRY*.

THERE are few worse quarters of an hour for the profession than those which learned judges devote to upsetting or discrediting established rules of construction. We all know the symptoms of the approach of these seasons. There are hints during the argument of counsel; remarks fall from the bench that "I really never could understand that case"; suggestions are made as to the absurdity of the results of the decision; and then the rumour begins to circulate in Lincoln's-inn that the rule of construction laid down in *Jones v. Smith* is going to be overruled. And overruled it is, or so discredited as to induce future legal authors to add a "But see the remarks of the court in *Brown v. Robinson*" to their statement of the effect of *Jones v. Smith*. Now this is lamentable. Granting that a rule of construction may have had its origin in the decision of an incapable judge, or in something which a capable judge may have said in his haste, or even in the misinterpretation by practitioners of the judgment of a very learned judge, these are not sufficient reasons for upsetting a rule of construction when it has once become established and followed in practice, so that conveyancers have founded upon it their opinions, and based upon it their drafts governing the devolution of property. We are persuaded that learned judges who with a light heart sweep away or throw doubt upon these rules, can have no adequate conception of the havoc they may may occasion.

The Court of Appeal has this week been throwing discredit on the rule in *Sibley v. Perry* (7 Ves. 522), in which case Lord Eldon has always been considered to have held that, where the word "issue" in a will is coupled with a reference to the "parent" of the "issue," the word "issue" is *prima facie* restricted to children of the parent. We have only before us at present the note of the remarks of the judges which will be found in another column, but this, we conceive, justifies us at once in entering our protest against what appears to us to be a wanton attack upon a well-established rule. In *Sibley v. Perry* a testator made bequests to several persons, if they should be living at his death, and if not, then he directed that their lawful issue should take the shares which their respective parents would have taken. Lord Eldon thought it clear that under this bequest children only were intended by "issue"; and he stopped Mr. Mansfield, who was arguing for the children, saying that in this will the word "issue" must mean "children"; and he reiterated this opinion after hearing counsel for the grandchildren. But next morning, as usual, the great Chancellor was afflicted with painful misgivings; he "expressed considerable doubt, upon looking into the authorities, whether this opinion was not too hasty," and directed the case to be re-argued. After hearing it re-argued, however, he remained of his former opinion, and, in delivering judgment, said (p. 529) that he had "not the least doubt that the actual intention of this testator was to give so much stock as he specifically had to persons under the word 'issue,' meaning children;" and, he added, among the reasons for this opinion, that "upon all the authorities it must be admitted that, if in the 3rd clause the words 'respective parents' were not inserted, the words 'lawful issue' must be extended beyond children." But, he said, in the clause referred to, "it is fair to put the ordinary sense upon the word 'parent,' viz., father or mother, and there the word 'issue' means children." It is true that, with his usual caution, he directed that in the declaration it should be stated that, "upon the true construction of this will, and the whole of it taken together, the testator, by the words 'lawful issue,' meant children;" but we think nothing can be clearer than that the ground of his opinion was the reference to the "parents" of the "issue." So, at all events, Vice-Chancellor Shadwell thought, for in *Fruen v. Osborne* (11 Sim. 138) he said that, "in *Sibley v. Perry* Lord Eldon put the same

construction on the word 'issue,' because he found that, in a particular clause, the use of the word 'parent' restricted the meaning of 'issue.'"

Lord Justice James, however, is reported to have said on Friday week in the case of *Ralph v. Carrick*, that "he regretted that *Sibley v. Perry* had ever been made a leading case, for he thought it clear that Lord Eldon never intended to lay down any general rule." It is, perhaps, difficult to say what Lord Eldon may have intended, but we have already quoted some of his observations, and we may be permitted to add that probably Sir William Grant was better able to judge of what Lord Eldon meant than even the most eminent judge of the present day; and Sir William Grant, in a case of *Harrington v. Lawrence*, decided in 1814 (unreported, but referred to in 11 Sim. 138), appears to have adopted the construction ascribed by Vice-Chancellor Shadwell to Lord Eldon—viz., that the use of the word "parent" restricts the meaning of "issue" to "children." So that only fourteen years after *Sibley v. Perry* was decided, we find the very rule of construction which Lord Justice James thinks Lord Eldon never meant to lay down, adopted and approved by the great master of equity jurisprudence who then sat at the Rolls. No one who knows anything of the judicial habits of those days can doubt that the subject would be thoroughly discussed between Lord Eldon and Sir W. Grant before the decision was given in *Harrington v. Lawrence*. And again, we find Vice-Chancellor Shadwell saying that he had "always considered it as settled that, in a will or a deed, if it is a question whether the word 'issue' shall be taken generally, or in a restricted sense, a direction that the issue shall take only the shares which their parents would have taken if living, must be taken to show that the word 'issue' was used in its restricted sense." And he refers to *Sibley v. Perry* and *Harrington v. Lawrence* as the authorities for this proposition. Whether, therefore, Lord Eldon did or did not intend to lay down a general rule, his decision in *Sibley v. Perry* has been followed by eminent judges; it may be for the reason (now perhaps a little lost sight of) which was once thus expressed by Lord Justice Knight Bruce (4 D. G. M. & G. 386), "well-knowing how very little is the chance that a man has of being right who, on a point of law or equity, differs from Lord Eldon." This being so, we submit that *Sibley v. Perry* has properly been made a leading case.

Lord Justice Cotton, in the recent case, appears to have agreed that *Sibley v. Perry* "laid down no general rule at all"; but he added that "it recognized" a general principle, and this general principle was "that 'issue' was capable of including all descendants, though it was capable of being controlled by expressions showing that it was used in a more restricted sense." With unfeigned respect for this learned judge, we venture to say that this observation is hardly worthy of his usual clearness and candour. If the decision in *Sibley v. Perry* did no more than this it did nothing at all. It was well established as a rule of construction, before *Sibley v. Perry*, that the word "issue" was capable of including all descendants, and, of course, this, like every other rule of construction, was subject to be controlled by expressions or indications in the will showing that the word was used in a different sense. For rules of construction are nothing more than judicial interpretation clauses attaching particular meanings to certain expressions in cases where the maker of the instrument has not otherwise expressly or impliedly shown that he attaches different meanings to such expressions. We think the extracts given above from Lord Eldon's judgment, and the construction placed upon it by his contemporaries, sufficiently show that the point decided in *Sibley v. Perry* was not merely that "issue" was capable of being controlled by manifestations of intention, but that the coupling of this word with the word "parent" is such a manifestation, and that "issue" is then *prima facie* to be considered as controlled, and restricted to children.

We do not enter on the question of the reasonableness of the rule, although on that we have a strong opinion. Our point is that, whether reasonable or unreasonable, the rule has now been established and acted upon for over half a century; it has found its way into the text-books; it has received the sanction of such judges as Sir W. Grant and Sir L. Shadwell, and it has been recognized by the House of Lords in *Martin v. Holgate* (15 W. R. 135, L. R. 1 H. L. at pp. 184, 186). What, then, can be the possible advantage of attempting to unsettle it?

EXECUTORS CHARGING COMMISSION ON ASSETS COLLECTED IN INDIA.

WE called attention some time ago (*ante*, p. 3) to the effect of section 56 of the Administrator-General's Act (Act II. of 1874), which removes the ground on which the Court of Chancery allowed an executor, to whom no legacy was given in his character of executor, a commission of five per cent. on all assets of the testator collected by him in India. We have since quoted an opinion given by the Advocate-General that an Indian executor or administrator who appropriates part of the estate as commission is guilty of a criminal breach of trust, and we may now, by way of completing our notice of the subject, give the following official letters.

The first letter is from Mr. Collis, the officiating Administrator-General of Bengal, to the Secretary of the Government of India, Home Department. It is dated the 18th of December, 1878, and is as follows:—

Enclosed will be found copies of the *SOLICITORS' JOURNAL*, November 2, and of the [*Calcutta*] *Englishman*, December 6, and I have the honour to call your attention to an article in the former entitled "Administration of estates of persons dying in India," and notes on that article in the latter. That commission is taken by persons other than the Administrators-General in administering to estates of deceased persons in India, and that the law, as laid down in section 56 of Act II. of 1874, is thus broken, I think, there can be no doubt. This illegal practice, in my opinion, amounts to a criminal breach of trust as defined by the Penal Code (see section 405, coupled with sections 23 and 24, which define "wrongful gain" and "dishonestly"). Putting the Penal Code to one side, I consider a person who takes commission or agency charges in cases contemplated by section 56, and thus breaks the law, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and has committed an indictable offence. In Russell on Crimes, vol. 1, p. 86, it is stated that where an offence is not so at common law, but made an offence by Act of Parliament, an indictment will lie when there is a substantive prohibitory clause, though there may be afterwards a particular provision and particular remedy. See also p. 87, which shows that wherever a statute forbids the doing of a thing, the doing of it wilfully, without any corrupt motive, is indictable. Now that a statement has appeared in the public press to the effect that the law is being frequently broken, and which statement the Government knows from previous communications from the Administrator-General to be correct, I would respectfully, but strongly, urge on Government the desirability of referring the question to the law advisers of the Crown. So far I have put the matter on strict legal grounds, but I think by the present illegal practice the interests of those most concerned are sacrificed, inasmuch as estates administered to by my office reap advantages which could not be obtained elsewhere; for instance, all remittances are made by me through the Government channel, while my books are open for examination by the Government auditors. Again, amply security is furnished by the Administrator-General for the faithful discharge of his duties. Moreover, I have every reason to believe that considerable cost is entailed on estates by the person administering thereto having to find security.

I have contented myself with looking at this matter from two points of view, namely, from the legal one, and from the one on which the parties interested might wish to be heard. There is a third view of the case, but which is so personal to the Administrator-General that I do not care to discuss it, especially as the attention of Govern-

ment has been already more than once called to it by Mr. Broughton. I may, however, be permitted to say that, while the illegal practice of which I complain was confined to one or two offenders, the result was not of very serious consequence to my office. Things are now changed, and I find this practice has considerably extended ever since I held office two years ago. Should the law advisers agree in my view of this question, and should their opinion be published, I hardly think this illegal course of conduct will be persevered in, and thus matters may be righted.

The next letter is from Mr. C. Bernard, C.S.I., the secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, to the Administrator-General, dated the 13th of March, 1879:—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1,296, dated the 18th of December, 1878, in which you—

(1) draw attention to the law (Act II. of 1874, section 56) which forbids any person, other than the Administrator-General, from receiving or retaining any commission or agency charges for anything done as executor or administrator under any probate or letters of administration;

(2) report that a practice is extending whereby private persons in Calcutta take commission on estates to which they administer;

(3) ask that the advice of the law officers be obtained, and that steps should be taken to make known that such taking of commission is illegal.

2. In accordance with your request the learned Advocate-General has been consulted; and I am now directed to forward a copy of Mr. Paul's opinion. [This we printed *ante*, p. 455.] He holds that a private person, who, in India, takes commission for anything done as executor or administrator, breaks the law and renders himself liable to penalties. And he advises that steps be taken to bring this provision of the law to the notice of the Court of Chancery in England, as that court may not be aware of the state of the Indian law on this point.

3. The Governor-General in Council observes that the office of Administrator-General was established in 1849, chiefly in order to provide safeguards against the maladministration of the estates of deceased persons by private firms. Those safeguards are four, namely,—the requirement of competent legal ability on the part of the Administrator-General; the requirement of large security for the due execution of his office; the stringent rules as to the investment of assets in the Administrator-General's hands; and the half-yearly examination of his accounts by auditors appointed by Government. A provision of law, corresponding to section 56 of the present Act which you quote, was inserted in Act VII. of 1849, the first Administrator-General's Act. Again, in 1855, when Act VIII. of that year was passed, an attempt was made to relax the rule prohibiting private executors and administrators from receiving commission for acts done as such. But the Legislative Council, guided by Sir Lawrence Peel, Sir Barnes Peacock, and Mr. Allen, refused to alter the law. The clear rule of law, as embodied in section 56 of Act II. of 1874, has been explained by the learned Advocate-General. The Governor-General in Council, as at present advised, has no intention of asking the Legislature to repeal that section. That being so, it is inexpedient that the law should be habitually disobeyed. The best way of making generally known the provisions of the law on this point, will be to publish the learned Advocate-General's opinion. Your letter, Mr. Paul's opinion, and the present reply will accordingly be published in the *Supplement to the Gazette of India*, and the result of such publication will doubtless be that the practices of which you complain will cease.

4. A copy of the present correspondence will be submitted to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, in order that he may, if he sees fit, cause the state of the Indian law on this point to be brought to the notice of the Court of Chancery, in any case which may arise respecting the allowance of commission to private persons administering to estates in India under the orders of that court.

General Correspondence.

REFORMS IN LEGAL PROCEDURE— MOTIONS FOR NEW TRIALS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Will you allow me through your columns to suggest for the consideration of the profession one or two reforms in the practice of the High Court of Justice, which, I think, could be carried out with great advantage and little difficulty?

1. The first is the discontinuance of the existing practice of granting rules *nisi* for new trials, and the substitution in lieu thereof of the notice of motion requiring the opposite side to appear in the first instance.

The main argument in favour of this reform is that it would expedite the final end of the litigation and tend to diminish expense; and the only objection to it that I am aware of is, that it would require the opposite party to appear on the motion in those cases where even a rule *nisi*, if applied for *ex parte*, would be refused.

The practical question depends upon the balance of advantages or disadvantages of the two modes of procedure as applicable to motions for new trials. Experience and observation have convinced me that the balance inclines overwhelmingly on the side of the notice of motion.

Take a sample of cases familiar and of frequent occurrence. In May, 1878, an action for the recovery of a debt and interest came on for trial; there was really no substantial defence, but the amount was large, and the defendant put the plaintiff to every possible technical difficulty; the defence as to the principal vanished, but there was a plausible, though, as it proved, groundless, point as to the interest; the jury in the result found a verdict for the plaintiff for the amount of principal and interest, and judgment was at once given by the presiding judge, who entertained no doubt as to the law or the merits of the case. The defendant then moved the Divisional Court *ex parte*, and, upon an imperfect and partial statement of the case, obtained a rule *nisi* calling upon the plaintiff to show cause why there should not be a new trial on the ground of misdirection and the verdict being against the evidence. The case then went into the "new trial paper," where it remained over the long vacation, until in November it began to make its appearance in the published lists of the day; but, owing to the practice of giving precedence day by day to motions over the new trial paper, it remained in this position for weeks, wearying and sickening every one engaged in it, until at last, in the middle of December, it was called on, and as soon as the facts were stated it collapsed, and the rule was discharged. This is every day's experience.

This statement, however, discloses but faintly the vexation and even frequent failure of justice that results from such a state of things. Rules *nisi* are granted that ought never to have been granted, and never could have been granted if the opposite side had been present. Vexatious delay, increased expense, and failure to secure the fruits of a just verdict are the too frequent effect of these *ex parte* rules *nisi*. On the other hand, it seems to me that if the defeated party thinks fit to move for a new trial, it is both just and expedient that he should be compelled to run the risk of having to pay the costs of the attendance, in the first instance, of the opposite party, who should be summoned to protect his interest against further unjust delay by the granting of an *ex parte* rule *nisi*.

The Common Pleas Division, which seems to be taking the lead in carrying out according to its spirit the new judicial procedure, has already sanctioned a precedent for the suggested reform. In the recent case of *Kain v. Farrer and others*, which is an action against the Board of Trade officials, the defendants are about to move for a new trial, and, with the concurrence of the

court, the plaintiffs will appear and oppose the motion in the first instance.

2. The next reform which I would suggest is that there should be no appeal from the decisions of the masters at chambers to a judge at chambers, but that all such appeals should be direct to the court, consisting in general of a single judge; the present system at chambers in a serious scandal and a disgrace to the administration of justice in a civilized country. This letter is already too long. With your permission, I will return to the subject on a future occasion.

April 28.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Some weeks since you were good enough to call attention to the provisions of the enactment of the last session of Parliament exempting houses and tenements occupied solely for professional purposes from the inhabited house duty. This led me to claim exemption from the payment of the duty in question, but I find that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, relying upon some decision of the Court of Exchequer, have held that I do not occupy a tenement, and that, therefore, I must pay the duty, which appears to me to defeat the object which the framers of the enactment had in view.

I took a large house in a West-end square on lease, requiring only a portion of the premises for offices, and letting the remainder on lease. My tenant carries on his business upon that part of the premises which he rents from me, and also resides therein. I do not, of course, reside. The commissioners hold that he is merely my sub-tenant, that the house is not let out in tenements, and that the duty upon the whole of the premises is payable by me. If a third person were the lessee and let the part I occupy as offices to me, and the remainder to my tenant, then the commissioners say that the house would be let out in tenements, and that that part of it which I occupy as offices would be exempt from the duty; but because I happen to be the lessee of the whole and occupy a part myself, the Act does not apply. I cannot help thinking that this construction defeats, to some extent, the object of the Legislature; and that, if you think so, you may, by calling attention to it, induce some member of the House of Commons to remedy what appears not to have been intended by the framers of the Act. The question affects a large number of persons, for it is often difficult to obtain suitable offices in a particular locality without being at the same time obliged to take the whole house, of which, as the whole of it is not needed, some portion has necessarily to be underlet.

April 28.

W. J. F.

PRIDEAUX'S PRECEDENTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I have used this work ever since I entered the profession, now more than sixteen years ago, and I have found it most useful, but I have often had to refer to other precedents in settling draft leases, on account of the insufficiency of the clauses contained in the forms of leases in Prideaux. In your review of the last edition you very properly noticed this deficiency, and I trust that in a future edition it will be remedied. What is wanted is one general precedent, setting forth in some detail the various clauses which may, under nearly every circumstance which may in reason be likely to arise, be required, so that the practitioner may adopt those he may require, and find the particular clause he may want to meet the terms of the tenancy for which he may have to provide. Take, for instance, the covenant to insure and the terms of insurance. Prideaux only provides one way, whereas in practice there are several ways in which the terms of the tenancy may in this respect be stated. There are other defects for which

I venture to think provision could be made by one or more general precedents of leases; and if they should be remedied in a future edition the editor will confer an additional benefit upon the profession. W.

Cases of the Week.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—STOPPAGE IN TRANSITU—END OF TRANSIT—CONTRACT TO DELIVER FREE ON BOARD AT A SPECIFIED PORT—SHIP CHARTERED BY PURCHASER.—In a case of *Ex parte The Rosevear Clay Company*, before the Court of Appeal on the 24th ult., a question arose as to the right of an unpaid vendor of goods to stop them *in transitu*. The contract between the vendor and the purchaser was that the former should deliver 100 tons of china clay "free on board at Fowey." The clay was to be paid for by a four months' acceptance of the purchaser. The purchaser did not inform the vendor of the ultimate destination of the clay, but he in fact intended to send it by ship to Glasgow, consigned to an agent of his own for sale there, and he entered into an agreement with the owner of a ship, called *The Forester*, to charter the ship to carry the clay from Fowey to Glasgow. The name of the ship was communicated to the vendor, who then delivered the clay on board at Fowey. Before the ship had left the harbour the vendor learnt that the purchaser was insolvent, and he thereupon gave notice to the captain to stop the clay *in transitu*. No bill of lading of the clay had then been signed, and the purchaser had not accepted the bill of exchange for the purchase-money. The captain of the ship, by the order of the vendor, carried the clay to another port, where it was sold on account of the vendor. Soon after the notice to stop had been given, the purchaser was adjudged a bankrupt upon an act of bankruptcy committed before the notice had been given. The trustee in the bankruptcy claimed the invoice price of the clay, and the question then arose whether there had been a valid stoppage *in transitu*. The Chief Judge held that the transit was at an end when the clay was delivered on board the ship in accordance with the agreement between the vendor and purchaser, and, consequently, that the claim of the trustee was well founded. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) reversed this decision, and held that the transit was not at an end, and that, consequently, the notice to stop was given in time. They said that it is well settled, the case of *Berndtson v. Strang* (16 W. R. 1025, L. R. 3 Ch. 588) being one of the latest authorities on the point, that a vendor's right to stop *in transitu* continues so long as the goods are in the possession of a carrier, as carrier, whether appointed by the vendor or the purchaser. When a ship is chartered to carry a cargo, the master of the ship does not become the servant or agent of the charterer, and the cargo is in his possession only as carrier. The transit is not at an end until the goods are actually, not constructively, delivered to the purchaser—i.e., delivered to him or to his servant or agent. It was attempted to distinguish *Berndtson v. Strang* and other cases of the kind, on the ground that in them the intended destination of the goods, after their delivery on board the ship chartered by the purchaser, had been communicated to the vendor by the original contract for sale. But the court held that this circumstance could make no difference, though, of course, if the goods had been delivered on the purchaser's own ship that would have been an actual delivery to him, and the right to stop *in transitu* would no longer have existed.

DISCLAIMER BY TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY—LEASE—POWER TO LESSEE TO DETERMINE LEASE—PROOF BY LESSOR FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY DISCLAIMER—MEASURE OF DAMAGE.—In a case of *Ex parte Blake*, before the Court of Appeal on the 24th ult., a question arose as to the amount for which a lessor was entitled to prove by reason of the disclaimer of the lease by the trustee in the liquidation of the lessee. The lease was of a dwelling-house for a term of twenty-one years, from the 25th of December, 1872, at a yearly rent of £130. It contained the usual covenants by the lessee, including one to repair the premises; and there was a proviso enabling the lessee to determine the lease at the expiration of the first seven or fourteen years of the

term, on giving six months' previous notice in writing to the lessor, and on paying the rent and performing the lessee's covenants up to the day of the term being so determined. In September, 1878, the lessee filed a liquidation petition, under which, on the 7th of October, a trustee was appointed. On the 4th of December the trustee executed a disclaimer of the lease. The lessor then tendered a proof in the liquidation—(1) for £140 damages for breach of the lessee's covenant to repair, notice to repair having been given on the 15th of November; (2) for £160, as being the loss caused to the lessor by the disclaimer, on the ground that the house could then only be let for £120 (instead of £130) a year, there being thus a depreciation in value of £10 a year, and the loss being calculated at that rate for the fifteen years of the term remaining unexpired. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) held, as the registrar had done, that the proof for the breach of the covenant to repair must be admitted, as must also a proof for £10, being the loss of rent for the remaining year of the first seven years of the term. They said that the lessee would have been entitled, on putting the premises in repair, or paying compensation for the want of repair, to determine the lease at the end of the seven years, and all the loss that the lessor had sustained was the difference between the value of the house out of repair and the house in repair, plus the £10 diminution in value for the remaining year of the first seven years. It must be assumed that the notice to determine the lease would have been given by the lessee, if he had remained solvent.

MINE OWNER—RIGHT TO THROW WATER ON ADJOINING MINE—USE OF PROPERTY.—On the 29th of April the Court of Appeal reversed the decision of Fry, J., in a case of *The West Cumberland Iron and Steel Company v. Kenyon* (L. R. 6 Ch. D. 773, 21 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 788). The question was as to the right of the owner of a mine to throw the water from his mine into the mine of a neighbouring owner. The defendants, whose mine adjoined that of the plaintiffs', and was situated on the rise of the strata from the plaintiffs' mine, had, as the court held upon the evidence, constructed a bore-hole, not in the ordinary and legitimate course of working their mine, but for the purpose of getting rid of the water. The water escaped at the bottom of the bore-hole, and found its way underground into some old unused workings, and thence ultimately into the plaintiffs' mine. The plaintiffs alleged that the construction of the bore-hole had considerably increased the quantity of water in their mine, and had put them to much larger expense in pumping, and they claimed an injunction and damages. Fry, J., was inclined, upon the evidence, to think that the same quantity of water would have flowed into the plaintiffs' mine, and in exactly the same manner, if the bore-hole had not been constructed, and the Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) held that this was proved. But Fry, J., was of opinion that this fact, even if proved, would be no defence to the action. He said that the defendants by collecting the water, which had formerly flowed in undefined natural channels, into a defined artificial channel, had appropriated it and made it their own, and were therefore responsible for it and could not expropriate it, and throw it on their neighbour's land otherwise than in the natural and proper use of their own land. They had taken the benefit of the water and must, therefore, also accept the burden. His lordship accordingly gave the plaintiffs an injunction and damages. James, L.J., said that when Fry, J., spoke of the defendants' appropriating the water he had not used a very accurate expression, for the last thing they wanted to do was to appropriate it. But what he intended to say was that, when once the water had found its way into the defendants' bore-hole, they were bound to discharge it so that it should not reach their neighbour's land. The Lord Justice said that he was not aware of any principle or authority for such a doctrine. He had always understood the law to be that a man might do anything he pleased with the water on his own land, provided that, when he had done with it, it did not affect his neighbour's land in any other way than it did before. A man might make any number of fishponds on his land, provided that he did not increase the burden on his neighbour. If the same quantity of water left his land through exactly the same aperture as before, what could that signify to his neighbour? That was the fact in the present case, and,

therefore, the action ought to have been dismissed. Brett, L.J., said that in order to succeed in such an action, the plaintiff must show that the defendant had used his land in an unnatural way, and also that that unnatural use had caused damage to the plaintiff. The plaintiff could not maintain his action without proving both these propositions. In the present case the plaintiffs had proved the first proposition, but not the second, and therefore they must fail. The mere fact that the defendants had obtained the temporary control of the water did not impose on them the responsibility of keeping it off their neighbour's land, or prevent them from afterwards restoring it into its natural flow on to that neighbour's land, unless they caused it to flow there in a different mode. Cotton, L.J., said that all that the defendants had done was to alter on their own land the course by which the water got into an underground reservoir, the overflow of which found its way on to the plaintiffs' land; there was no alteration in the quantity or the mode of that overflow, and therefore no damage to the plaintiffs.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—LIFE ESTATE BY IMPLICATION—GIFT TO HEIR-AT-LAW (OR NEXT OF KIN) AND A STRANGER ON DEATH OF A.—“DESCENDANTS.”—On the 25th ult. the Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.J.J.) affirmed a decision of Hall, V.C., in a case of *Ralph v. Carriek* (25 W. R. 530, L. R. 5 Ch. D. 984). A testator had by his will given his property, real and personal, to trustees upon trust for the payment of debts, legacies, costs, and expenses, and after such payment, and after the death of his wife, the whole residue of his property, real and personal, was to be divided into twelve equal portions, whereof three portions were to be given to the children of his late aunt W., equally among them, the descendants (if any) of those who might have died being entitled to the benefit which their deceased parent would have received had he or she been then alive. The remaining portions were to be given, as in the will specified, to the children and descendants of other late aunts of the testator, and should there be no children or lawful descendants of any of his aunts remaining at the time the bequests should be payable, the portions so bequeathed were given over. Some of the children of the testator's aunts were his co-heirs-at-law, and some of them were his next of kin; some of the children were not co-heirs, and some were not next of kin. The question was whether the testator's widow took a life estate by implication. The court held that when there was a gift to a testator's heir-at-law (or next of kin) and a stranger on the death of A., there was no implication of a life estate to A., as there would be if the gift had been simply to the heir-at-law or next of kin. Another question in the case was as to the meaning to be given to the word “descendants”—whether it was to be restricted to children of the children of the testator's aunts, or whether it was to be construed as including remoter descendants, there being some great grandchildren of some of the aunts living at the death of the testator's widow. The Vice-Chancellor decided that only children of the children of the aunts were included, holding that the case was governed by *Sibley v. Perry* (7 Ves. 522), in which Lord Eldon decided that the word “issue,” in conjunction with the word “parent,” was to be confined to children of the first taker. The Court of Appeal reversed the decision of the Vice-Chancellor on this point. James, L.J., said that it was to be regretted that *Sibley v. Perry* had ever been made a leading case, for he thought it clear that Lord Eldon did not intend to lay down any general rule. He found that there was one gift in the will then before him which clearly showed that the testator was there using the word “issue” as including only children, and held that the word ought to receive the same interpretation in the rest of the will. *Sibley v. Perry* had, however, been since treated as laying down a general rule, but the only rule deducible from it was that, when the word “issue” was used in collocation with the word “parent,” it must be confined to children. His lordship thought that the consequences which might result from the rule had not been fully considered. But the word “issue” was an ambiguous word. In the ordinary parlance of laymen it meant children, and children only. In the language of lawyers it included all descendants, and in *Sibley v. Perry* Lord Eldon found that the word was used in the layman's, not in the lawyer's sense. But the word “descendants” was a perfectly unambiguous word; no lay-

man or lawyer ever used it as signifying children only; it was always used as including descendants to any degree of remoteness. Therefore *Sibley v. Perry* was no authority whatever for the construction of the present will. But, even if the word used had been “issue,” instead of “descendants,” his lordship thought that the case could not be distinguished from *Ross v. Ross* (20 Beav. 645), which he held to have been rightly decided. When there was a gift over, the settled rule was that the primary gift must, if possible, be construed as being co-extensive with the gift over. Here the gift over was on the failure of the “children or descendants” of the aunts, which showed that the word “descendants” was used as signifying other persons than the children. His lordship entertained no doubt that all the descendants of the children of the aunts living at the time specified were to take, *per stirpes* not *per capita*, and the order of the Vice-Chancellor must be varied accordingly. Cotton, L.J., said that he should be loath to depart from a general rule of construction laid down by any judge, or to distinguish a case on slight grounds. A general rule of construction, however, only meant this, that, unless there was something in the will to control them, certain expressions were to bear a particular meaning. The general rule could always be controlled by sufficient expressions in the particular will. So far as the decision in *Sibley v. Perry* itself went, it laid down no general rule at all; the general principle recognised by it was that “issue” is a word capable of including all descendants, though it was capable of being controlled by expressions showing that it was used in a more restricted sense.

COMPANY—WINDING-UP—REPUTED OWNERSHIP—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 15, SUB-SECTION 5—JUDICATURE ACT, 1875, s. 10.—In a case of *Re Crumlin Viaduct Works Company*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 26th ult., the question arose in the winding up of the above company whether the order and disposition clause of the Bankruptcy Act applied to the winding up of a company. The company had mortgaged (*inter alia*) personal chattels and stock-in-trade to secure debentures. These effects were in the possession of and upon the premises of the company at the date of the winding-up order. No attempt to take possession of them had been previously made, and they were afterwards sold by arrangement. A summons had been taken out by the liquidator asking that the proceeds of sale might be paid over to him as part of the assets of the company. The contention on behalf of the liquidator was that, by virtue of section 10 of the Judicature Act, 1875, the order and disposition clause of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869 (section 15, sub-section 5), applied to the winding up of companies, and that the proceeds of the chattels were divisible amongst the creditors generally. The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that section 10 of the Judicature Act, 1875, did not extend the bankruptcy rules as to reputed ownership to the winding up of companies, and, therefore, he dismissed the summons.

VACANT BENEFICE—DILAPIDATIONS—ORDER FOR REPAIRS—IRREGULARITY—ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS ACT, 1871 (34 & 35 VICT. c. 43), ss. 8, 29–36.—In an adjourned summons of *Re Sockett's Estate*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 28th ult., a novel question arose as to the construction of several sections of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871. By section 29 of that Act, “within three calendar months after the avoidance of any benefice, the bishop shall direct the surveyor” (*i.e.*, the diocesan surveyor appointed under section 8), “who shall inspect the buildings of such benefice, and report to the bishop what sum, if any, is required to make good the dilapidations to which the late incumbent or his estate is liable.” By section 30 the surveyor is to send copies of the report to the new and old incumbents, or the latter's representatives, and he is to certify to the bishop when and to whom and in what manner each copy was sent. By section 31, “the report shall state what works (if any) are in the opinion of the surveyor needed, specifying the same in detail, and may state any special circumstances, and shall state what sum, in the opinion of the surveyor, will be required to make good the dilapidations.” By section 32 both incumbents, or the representatives of the old incumbent, may state in writing for the bishop objections to the report on any grounds of fact or law, “and in such case the

bishop may, if he shall think fit, at the expense of the party objecting, direct a second report to be made by some competent person, or take the opinion of counsel upon any question of law." Section 33 provides as to the time for objecting. By section 34 the bishop "shall in uncontested cases, as soon as conveniently may be after the time for the transmission of objections has expired, and in contested cases after consideration of the whole matter, make an order stating the repairs and their cost for which the late incumbent, his executors or administrators, is or are liable." Section 35 provides as to the delivery of the order to the different parties, and by section 36 the sum stated in the order as the cost of the repairs, shall be a debt due from the late incumbent, his executors or administrators, to the new incumbent, and shall be recoverable as such at law or in equity." It appeared that what was called a report had been made, signed by two surveyors, who claimed to be diocesan surveyors, but who had apparently not been appointed according to the provisions of section 8. One of these surveyors had inspected the rectory, but the report did not specify the repairs to be done, but stated the house would require to be entirely rebuilt at a probable cost of about £480. The works to be done were generally "to remove the present house and buildings." On this report being sent to the bishop some discussion took place between the parties, and the new incumbent suggested that the house should be rebuilt on a smaller scale, and thereupon the same surveyor re-inspected the premises, and stated that the amount might in that case be reduced by the sum of £130, and the bishop made an order accordingly to the effect that the sum of £350 was to be paid by the old incumbent, and that the works specified in the schedule were to be done. The order contained, however, no schedule. The question was now raised, in the administration of the old incumbent's estate, whether his estate was liable to pay the sum of £350. The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that the report was irregular, as not being that of the diocesan surveyor under section 8; it should, moreover, have exactly followed the words of section 31, and have stated what works were necessary. The surveyor had no power to state, as he had done, that the house should be rebuilt or reinstated. If the report were uncontested, then the bishop, he considered, although this was not stated in the Act, was bound to make an order under section 34 in accordance with it, and could not increase or alter the amount stated in the report. In contested cases—and the present must be taken to fall within that category—the bishop, he thought, was bound to reconsider the matter, and then, if he thought the report was wrong he could apparently, under section 32, direct a second report to be made by another surveyor, not the diocesan surveyor. The bishop then apparently had to reconsider the whole matter, and could allow or disallow the report or state a case for counsel. The effect of the sections was, he thought, in contested cases to make the bishop a judge in the matter, and that he must adjudicate upon it after a statement of the objections had been communicated to the other side. The result was that the whole proceedings had been irregular and not in accordance with the Act; no debt had been created under the 36th section, and the claim must be disallowed.

DRAMATIC COPYRIGHT ACT—TENANCY IN COMMON OF COPYRIGHT—3 WILL. 4, c. 15—LICENCE TO REPRESENT BY ONE JOINT OWNER.—In a case of *Powell v. Head*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 29th ult., an important question was argued whether, under the Dramatic Copyright Act, a licence to represent a dramatic piece given by one joint owner was good as against the other joint owner. Two persons were entitled in equal moieties as tenants in common to the copyright in an opera. The defendant obtained the consent of one of the two owners and represented the piece. This action was now brought by the other joint owner seeking damages for the wrongful representation. By section 1 of 3 Will. 4, c. 15, the author of any dramatic piece (not printed or published by the author or his assignee) and his assignees shall have as his own property the sole liberty of representing or causing to be represented any such production as aforesaid, and shall be deemed and taken to be the proprietor thereof. By section 2, if any person during the continuance of the copyright represents or causes to be represented, without the consent in writing of the author or

other proprietor first had and obtained, at any place within the limits mentioned in the 1st section, every such offender shall be liable to the penalties mentioned in the section. By section 4, "whenever authors, persons, offenders, or others, are spoken of in the singular number, the same shall extend to the plural number." The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that the rule was well settled that in equity, whatever might have been the old rule at law, any joint owner could get a receiver or manager of chattels appointed, and could restrain any dealings therewith contrary to his wishes. As to the construction of the Act, he was clear that any representation without the consent of all the proprietors was wrongful, and would render the offender liable to the penalties mentioned in the section. He considered that where there was such a wrongful act any joint owner could sue, and he, therefore, gave judgment for the plaintiffs for half the amount of the minimum penalty imposed by the 2nd section, with costs.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—PREFERENTIAL CLAIM—DEBT DUE BY BANK TO FRIENDLY SOCIETY—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT, 1875, s. 15.—In a case of *In re the West of England, &c., Bank*, before Fry, J., on the 26th of April, a question arose upon the construction of section 15 of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875, which provides that upon the bankruptcy or insolvency of any officer of a friendly society having in his possession by virtue of his office any money or property belonging to the society, the money shall be paid or the property delivered over to the trustees of the society in preference to any other debts or claim against the estate of such officer. The bank had acted as treasurers of a friendly society, having been so appointed by the directors. When the bank stopped payment a balance was due from it to the society, and the society claimed in the winding up of the bank to be paid in priority under the provision of the above section. Fry, J., refused the application on several grounds—(1) that section 15 did not apply to the winding up of a company; (2) that the section applied only to an individual acting as an officer of a friendly society, and not to a corporation so acting; (3) that the acceptance on behalf of the bank of the office of treasurer was *ultra vires*; and (4) that the society, by not requiring sureties for their treasurer, in accordance with the provisions of their rules, had forfeited any right given to them by section 15. Such a section, his lordship said, which interferes with the ordinary rights of other creditors, must be construed strictly.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—WIFE'S CHOSE IN ACTION—REDUCTION INTO POSSESSION.—In a case of *Daridier v. Chapman*, before Fry, J., on the 28th of April, a question arose as to the reduction into possession of a wife's chose in action by her husband. The wife was the administratrix of the estate of an intestate, in which she had also a beneficial interest. An agent authorized by the husband and wife received a sum of money due to the estate and appropriated it to his own use. The husband afterwards died, having appointed the agent his executor. Fry, J., held, upon the authority of *Huntley v. Griffith* (F. Moore, 452; Goldsborough, 159), that the receipt by the agent amounted to a reduction into possession by the husband of the wife's beneficial interest in the money, and that the agent must, in an action to administer the husband's estate, account for the wife's beneficial interest as part of the husband's estate. *Cooper v. Cooper* (L. R. 7 H. L. 53), showed that the circumstance that the wife was entitled only to a distributive share of the money made no difference.

The Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford, Sir H. S. Maine, M.A., D.C.L., proposes to deliver a public lecture in the hall of Corpus Christi College on Saturday May 10.

VALUE OF LEASEHOLD PROPERTY IN THE CITY.—At the Mart, on Wednesday, Mr. F. Statham Hobson, of Coleman-street, disposed of the lease, with possession, of a house in Finsbury-pavement, and one in Little Moorfields, for £3,150. The lease was held direct from the Corporation for a term of fifteen years unexpired.

Societies.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the directors was held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 1st inst., the following being present, viz.:—Mr. Desborough (chairman), and Messrs. Tylee, Burges, Carpenter, Colliason, Parkin, Sawtell, Scadding, Steward, Styan, and Boodle (secretary). The report of the directors to be submitted to the annual general court on the 22nd inst., was considered and approved; one new member was elected; and Mr. Boodle, who had been secretary for upwards of twenty-two years, resigned that office, his resignation being accepted with extreme regret, and the directors appointed Mr. A. B. Carpenter, of 3, Elm-court, Temple, to be his successor.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

This society met as usual at the Law Institution, London, on the 29th ult., Mr. S. Garrett, M.A., in the chair. The question for discussion was—"Is the tendency of modern times towards the obliteration of national distinctions in Europe?" Mr. J. A. Neale, B.A., opened the discussion in the negative, and this side was supported in the debate that ensued by Mr. Ellis and Mr. Napier. Mr. Lloyd Jones maintained the affirmative, and also Mr. Van Sommer, who deprecated the fact, and Mr. Garrett, who considered it an unmitigated good. At the conclusion of the debate the opener replied, and on the question being put to the meeting, the majority of votes were given for the affirmative.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At the usual weekly meeting of the society on Wednesday last, Mr. C. Parsons opened in the affirmative the following motion:—"That there is at present too great a prevalence in this country of the system of competitive examinations." Mr. Parsons was supported by Mr. Owen, and opposed by Messrs. Bartrum, Bateman, Napier, and Marsden, the debate being of a very animated description. The motion was carried by a majority of three.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The forty-second half-yearly general meeting of the members of this association was held on Wednesday, April 30, at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, H. S. Wasbrough, Esq., of Bristol, chairman of the board, presiding.

The secretary having read the notice convening the meeting, and the minutes of the last half-yearly meeting, which were confirmed, the forty-second report of the board, as printed and circulated at the meeting was agreed to be taken as read. The report was as follows:—

The Board of Directors have the pleasure of presenting this their forty-second half-yearly report of the progress and operations of the association during the past six months.

Since October last 108 gentlemen have been admitted members of the association, seventeen as life and ninety-one as annual members; and the total number of members enrolled is now 2,554, of whom 947 are life, and 1,607 annual members. Forty-three life members are also annual contributors to the association of from one to five guineas each.

The receipts of the association during the past half-year, with the balance of £355 19s. 4d. remaining from the previous account, have amounted, as will be seen by the audited balance sheet appended hereto, to £2,477 2s. 6d.; included in which the board have the pleasure of reporting bequests to the association from two solicitors, who were members; one of five hundred pounds from the late William Spours, Esq., of Charlton-hall, Alnwick; and one of fifty pounds from the late John Smale Torr, Esq., of Bedford-row, London. In respect of the first-mentioned bequest, the board have exercised the power confided to them under the fourth rule, by conferring an honorary life membership upon the executor of the late Mr. Spours, Mr. William John Carr, solicitor, of Alnwick.

A sum of £690 has been distributed in relief; £255 in grants of from £30 to £50, among six applicants of the primary, or "members'" class; and £435 in grants of from

£5 to £20 among thirty-six applicants of the secondary, or "non-members'" class.

A sum of £1,178 8s. 9d. has been invested in purchase of three per cent. reduced stock; and at the date of closing the account, a balance of £298 11s. 9d. remained with the Union of London, and £15 in the hands of the secretary.

The entire invested fund of the association now consists of £8,000 consols; £4,237 0s. 6d. reduced three per cent.; £8,000 India five per cents.; £11,000 India four per cents.; £4,207 London and North Western Railway four per cent. perpetual debenture stock, and £250 London and St. Katharine Docks four per cent. debenture stock; making a total of £35,694 0s. 6d. stock, and producing annual dividends amounting to £1,356 10s.

The board regret to have to report the decease of a colleague during the half year—Mr. George Christopher Roberts, of Hull, in whose place at the board they have elected Mr. Henry John Ware, of York.

The board have great pleasure in announcing that the Right Hon. The Lord Justice Sir Richard Baggallay has kindly consented to preside at the ensuing anniversary festival of the association, which will take place at the Star and Garter Hotel, Richmond, Surrey, on Monday, the 16th of June next. They very earnestly hope that there will be a numerous attendance of members at the dinner to support the right hon. president; and that, aided by the kind and hearty co-operation of their brother members generally, the association will gain through the approaching festival a large accession of funds and new members.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the report, said that, as compared with the corresponding periods of previous years, the result of the last half-year's work showed a decided progress, and he thought they had reason to congratulate themselves upon the position of the society, which he hoped would be still further improved by means of the approaching anniversary festival, to be held at the Star and Garter, Richmond, on the 16th of June next, when he trusted that the members of the association would assemble numerously to cordially support the president. He had great pleasure in reading the following letter to them, which had just been placed in his hands, from the president of the Incorporated Law Society:—

"Mincing-lane, April 23, 1879.

"My dear Mr. Janson,—I fear I must conclude that your attempt to effect an amalgamation of the two Benevolent Societies is not likely to be successful. Much as I regret this, I am not disposed longer to abstain from sending my contribution to the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and, therefore, I venture to request you to hand the enclosed (a cheque for £100) to the proper representative of that society. Hoping you will forgive me for thus troubling you,—I remain, my dear Mr. Janson, yours very faithfully,

JOHN HOLLAMS.

"F. H. Janson, Esq."

Mr. SIDNEY SMITH, the deputy-chairman of the Board, said he had great pleasure in seconding the adoption of the report, which was accordingly agreed to unanimously.

A resolution of thanks to the directors and auditors for their valuable services having been moved by Mr. R. W. WALL, and seconded by Mr. J. W. PROUDFOOT, was passed unanimously.

Mr. CLEMENT UVEDALE PRICE then proposed, and Mr. WM. BERRIAH BROOK seconded, a vote of thanks to the chairman for presiding, to which the chairman responded. The meeting then terminated.

LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

LIABILITY OF EMPLOYERS.—On Monday evening Mr. Joseph Brown, Q.C., read a paper before this society, on the four Bills now before Parliament for extending the liability of public companies and other employers to their servants for injuries arising from accidents. Sir Arthur Hobhouse presided in the first part of the meeting, and Mr. Brassey, M.P., subsequently. Mr. Brown commenced by describing the proposals of Mr. Macdonald's Bill; which Bill abolished any defence founded on the doctrine of common employment in the same service, or founded on the fact that the injured servant knowingly and voluntarily incurred the risk, and extended not merely to workmen engaged in mines, collieries, and other large works, but to all servants in all employments, and, of course, to domestic servants. In

future, if Mr. Macdonald's Bill passed, every gentleman would have to pay his domestic servants for an injury caused by a fellow-servant's fault. These nominal liabilities of the master of a house were trivial compared with those which the Bill would put on large employers of labour, such as the owners of mines and collieries and railway companies, who had hundreds of men in their service. From the returns made to Parliament of accidents in mines, collieries, and railways, it was certain the Bill would very greatly increase the claims for accidents now made on owners. It was obvious that if owners could not stand under this additional load and were obliged to cease working, a large number of workmen would be deprived of the employment by which they had hitherto earned their living. Mr. Brown urged that the Bill was unjust, and would also be impolitic, inasmuch as it would take away from the men the need to insure; and he held that the man who would not forego the price of a pint of beer weekly to provide against accidents must accuse his own improvidence if he was thrown upon the public charity. Moreover, one strong inducement to workmen to exercise some vigilance over their fellow-men would be removed if they were to be all insured by the employer against accident and to an unlimited extent. Mr. Brown then proceeded to discuss the Attorney-General's Bill making the employers liable to their own workmen for injuries caused by any "servant in authority," and said that it carried out in substance the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee, and being carefully drawn so as not to go beyond these limits presented a strong contrast to Mr. Macdonald's Bill; but he was unable to see in the Government Bill any sufficient advantage to justify the extension of an inequitable rule of law to a new class of cases or to atone for the violation of principle involved in it.

Mr. BRASSEY, M.P., speaking for his own Bill, said that his experience had shown him that railway companies did injustice to their servants in cases of accidents, and he held that railway servants were liable for accidents in circumstances in which they were obeying orders, orders which they could not question, judge, or consider. He held that provision for further compensation of men injured under such circumstances ought to be made.

Mr. CLARK, Q.C., while admiring the spirit in which Mr. Brassey had spoken, supported the views expressed in the paper. Sir A. Hobhouse spoke against the principle of one man being rendered liable for the act of another. Mr. Macdonald, M.P., contended for the existing necessity for his measure, and Sir Henry Jackson, M.P., criticized the various Bills. Other speakers followed, and thanks were voted to the reader and chairman.

Obituary.

MR. WILLIAM BENNETT.

Mr. William Bennett, solicitor, of Chapel-en-le-Frith, died on the 16th ult. Mr. Bennett was born in 1797, and was admitted a solicitor in 1819; he had practised at Chapel-en-le-Frith for nearly sixty years. He held several important offices. In 1834 he was appointed clerk to the County Magistrates at Chapel-en-le-Frith, and held that office until his death, though his son had recently been associated with him as joint clerk. He had also been clerk to the Guardians of the Chapel-en-le-Frith Union ever since its formation, and superintendent registrar for the district. On the passing of the County Courts Act, 1846, he was appointed assistant clerk of the Chapel-en-le-Frith County Court, and a few years later he became registrar of the county court both there and at Buxton. Mr. Bennett discharged his official duties in such a way as to command the esteem and respect of all the professional men in the district. His private practice was very extensive; the soundness of his judgment being well known, and his tact and discretion were often the means of preventing litigation. Mr. Bennett devoted most of his leisure time to literary and archaeological pursuits, and he had published several novels, under the *nom de plume* of Lee Gibbons. His health had been very delicate throughout the winter, and his death was not unexpected.

MR. NORMAN BENNETT.

Mr. Norman Bennett, the son of the above-mentioned gentleman, was born in 1831, and was admitted a solicitor in

1865. He was in partnership with his father, with whom he was associated as joint clerk to the County Magistrates. A few weeks ago he had succeeded his father in the office of clerk to the Board of Guardians, but he had been for some time in weak health. Like his father, he was extremely popular throughout the district, and his premature death is universally deplored. He leaves a widow and four children. Mr. N. Bennett died about an hour before his father, and the deaths have excited a wide-spread feeling of sympathy in the district.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. GAINSFORD BRUCE, barrister, has been appointed Solicitor-General for the County Palatine, Durham, in succession to the late Mr. Joseph Kay, Q.C. Mr. Bruce was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1859, and is a member of the North-Eastern Circuit. He is the author (in conjunction with the late Mr. Robert Griffith Williams, Q.C.) of a work on Admiralty Practice, and he was appointed recorder of the borough of Bradford in 1877.

Mr. RICHARD DAVIES, of 35, Southampton-buildings, and 8, Camberwell-park, Surrey, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Legal News.

The Incorporated Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool have forwarded to the House of Commons a petition praying the House "not to listen to any proposals, direct or indirect, which have for their object the abolition of the court established under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1873," but to continue, strengthen, and extend the powers of the Railway Commissioners, which the petitioners say have been usefully and beneficially exercised in the interest of the railway companies themselves as well as of the general public, and the extinction of which would be regarded by the Chamber as equivalent to a national calamity.

On the 24th ult., in the House of Commons, Sir W. Barttelot asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what was the practice as to exempting persons becoming bound under articles of clerkship to solicitors from the necessity of passing an examination in general knowledge, as provided by the Solicitors Acts, 1860 and 1877. Mr. Cross said the answer to the question of his hon. and gallant friend would be found in section 11 of the Act 40 & 41 Vict., c. 25, which empowered the presidents of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions of the High Court, and the Master of the Rolls, or any one of them, on the presentation of a memorial showing special circumstances, to allow the preliminary examination to be dispensed with. His hon. and gallant friend was, he believed, to move for a return on the subject, which there was no objection to grant.

At a meeting of the Court of Common Council of the city of London on the 24th ult. a report was brought up from the Law and City Courts Committee, on the reference to them to consider the County Courts Bill introduced into the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor, and suggesting that they should actively oppose the measure and have a conference with her Majesty's Government thereon. Mr. Woodbridge, the chairman, stated that the Bill was one of a very sweeping character; that, if carried, any actions for whatever amount might be brought in county courts; that great power was given to the judges to disallow costs; and that five-sixths of the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court would be swept away. After a short discussion, in which Mr. Bedford and others spoke in favour of the Bill, the report was ordered to be printed and circulated with the Bill itself among the members, and the discussion was adjourned.

In the House of Commons on the 24th ult., Mr. Dodds asked the Attorney-General whether in the year 1876 the Lord Chancellor sent a circular to the judges of the county courts requesting them, when they ordered the prosecution of a bankrupt, to make it part of the order that the trustee

should employ the Solicitor to the Treasury to conduct the prosecution, or, as an alternative, to "cause the registrar to direct the trustees to employ such solicitor, and to inform him that if he employs any other solicitor no costs will be allowed over and above the amount which may be allowed under section 17 of the Debtors Act, 1869;" and, if so, whether he would state under what authority that step was taken by his lordship. The Attorney-General said that in the year 1876 the Lord Chancellor did send a circular letter to the judges of the county courts containing the requests referred to in the question of the hon. and learned member. I shall be happy to lay on the table of the House a copy of this letter if it is desired. The Debtors Act, 1869, s. 17, provides that the costs of the prosecution of a bankrupt shall be allowed, paid, and borne as expenses of prosecutions for felony are allowed, paid, and borne. These costs are the only costs which in strictness the prosecutor is entitled to, but generally, in prosecutions under the Debtors Act, there are extra costs, which are in some cases extremely large, and it is obviously impossible for the Treasury to undertake to pay such costs unless it has a control over the conduct of the prosecution. The Treasury cannot have such control unless the prosecution is confided to the Solicitor to the Treasury. The step taken by the Lord Chancellor was taken with the sanction of the Treasury.

THE LAND TITLES AND TRANSFER COMMITTEE.

THE Lord Chancellor gave evidence before this committee on Monday. His lordship said that Lord Westbury considered that his Bill was one for a registry of title, and in one sense no doubt it was, but it was not one for the registry of title in the sense in which that phrase was now understood. It was for a registry of assurances, and was in his (the Lord Chancellor's) opinion open to very serious objections. Lord Westbury proposed to make the administration depend upon an office of registry. He wished to speak with great respect of every one connected with that office, but he did not think from its nature that it was calculated to command that confidence in the minds of the public as a scheme on the Irish precedent would have commanded. He did not think Lord Westbury's Act had been resorted to very largely, and that had had an injurious effect on the matter generally, as the question did not stand in such a favourable position for the making of experiments as it had stood formerly. He had seen a great many objections made to the form of the Act and to its working, but he must confess that nearly every one had arisen from want of information as to what was inside the Act. It was true that the title to land in Australia was much simpler than in England; but in that colony, as in Scotland, titles began from the Crown, and dealing with land was more a matter of commerce than it was at home.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I have an idea that we are beginning at the wrong end in simplifying transfers. Ought we not rather to commence by simplifying titles?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR.—I don't know what is meant by simplifying titles. If it is meant that some restraint should be put on dealings with land in a complicated way, I should like to know what legislation is proposed. As to putting land on the register by compulsion, the difficulty has always struck me in this way: There is, in the first place, the question how far you have a right to make the adoption of a particular system compulsory. But there is a question of still greater importance, namely, how far it is possible to make it compulsory. No way that has as yet been proposed would have had the effect of putting all land on the register. If you made registration compulsory, you must open a very complicated system of local officers, and you must have your whole machinery in existence before the Act begins to work, and that would be an enormous thing. In the next place, you must take care to do the work at a cost very much smaller than the fees proposed for registration. A system of searchers would be necessary, and if there is a system of searchers you must have an index. In further examination the Lord Chancellor said there was a tendency throughout the country to shorten deeds of all kinds. The only way in which Parliament could shorten them was by providing forms, and saying certain signs or words shall mean so and so—shall mean very much more than at first appears. But those who are

accustomed to deal with deeds find that, in our commonest forms, there are seldom cases which do not require some alteration or other.

MR. LOWE.—You did not approve of Lord Westbury's Bill?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR.—No; it appeared to me to have all the elements of evil attendant on a registry of deeds and none of its advantages, because in place of registering deeds his measure proposed that the register office should register its view of what a deed was.

Therefore its failure must not be taken as an argument against the success of any other scheme?—Of course not.

Would it not be an advantage that the working of a new system should be intrusted to persons in the prime of life, whose minds are supple and capable of dealing with such matters as these?—I don't like speaking of individuals in such cases as this, but I have stated on previous occasions that I always regretted that the working of a system of this kind has been put in the hands of a registry office, instead of being placed in the hands of a court analogous to the Irish Landed Estates Court. The public confidence in the system would have been very much greater if it had been established on the Irish precedent. If a register system is carried out satisfactorily when a man has been on it for thirty or forty years, he would not need to show any title to his land beyond the fact that his name was on the register.

SIR H. JACKSON.—To make the system perfect do you not think that local registers are necessary?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR.—No doubt they would greatly facilitate the ascertaining of what has taken place in the past. The difficulty in this matter would be one of expense. With regard to a map which might be prepared on a large scale showing all the properties in the country, no doubt as time went on such a thing might be prepared, and would prove very valuable in facilitating search, but he should not like to say that they would be able to do away with all other forms of transfer and trust to a map alone.

By MR. MARTIN.—If the plan of providing district registries were adopted, a formidable number of register offices would have to be established—there would have to be as many offices as there were county courts, no doubt.

The committee again adjourned.—Standard.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

APRIL 24.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Stuckgown Estate, Tipton Local Board, Brighton and Hove Gas, Manchester Corporation Water, Lewes Cattle Market.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT. GREAT SEAL. ASSESSED RATES ACT AMENDMENT.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT (1875) AMENDMENT (passed through Committee).

BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, &c. (ARMY).

APRIL 25.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Glossop Gas, Gosport Street Tramways.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

GREAT SEAL. ASSESSED RATES ACT AMENDMENT (both passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Grand Junction Water, North and South Woolwich Subway.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT (1875) AMENDMENT.

BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Westgate and Birchington Water, London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, London and South-Western and London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Companies (Steam Vessels), London, Brighton, and South Coast and South-Eastern Railway Companies.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

COUNTY COURTS (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—East and West India Dock Company, Bury St. Edmund's Gas, Nottingham Water, New River Company.

GREAT SEAL. ASSESSED RATES ACT AMENDMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APRIL 24.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Birmingham Gas, London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), Midland Railway.

APRIL 25.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Lancaster Gas, Warrington Corporation.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Birmingham Corporation Water, Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Richardson's Estate.

APRIL 29.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bromley Gas, Southend Gas, Weymouth and Melcombe Regis Bridge.

APRIL 30.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

BANKING LAW AMENDMENT.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

FURTHER RELIEF OF TRUSTEES (Mr. Wheelhouse).

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, May.....	5 Mr. King	Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Jackson
Tuesday.....	6 Merivale	Farrer	Cobby
Wednesday.....	7 King	Teesdale	Jackson
Thursday.....	8 Merivale	Farrer	Cobby
Friday.....	9 King	Teesdale	Jackson
Saturday.....	10 Merivale	Farrer	Cobby
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice Fry.
Monday, May.....	5 Mr. Ward	Mr. Latham	Mr. Koe
Tuesday.....	6 Pemberton	Leach	Clowes
Wednesday.....	7 Ward	Latham	Koe
Thursday.....	8 Pemberton	Leach	Clowes
Friday.....	9 Ward	Latham	Koe
Saturday.....	10 Pemberton	Leach	Clowes

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

May 6.—Messrs. CHINNOCK, GALSWORTHY, & CHINNOCK, at the Mart, Shares in the County Fire and Law Life Assurance Offices (see advertisement, April 26, p. 522).

May 6.—Messrs. HASLAM & SON, at the Queen's Hotel, Reading, Freehold Properties (see advertisement, April 12, p. 474).

May 7.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Building Land (see advertisement, April 5, p. 4).

May 7.—Mr. F. STATHAM HOBSON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).

May 7.—Mr. JOHN LEES, at the Mart, at 12 a.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, April 26, p. 522).

May 8.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Estates (see advertisement, this week, p. 6).

May 8.—Messrs. HARDE, VAUGHAN, & JENKINSON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

FORWARD.—April 20, at the Elms, Axminster, the wife of William Forward, solicitor, of a son.

HUTCHINSON.—April 20, at Aytoun-road, Stockwell, the wife of J. J. Hutchinson, solicitor, of a son.

JONES.—April 18, at 27, Edge-lane, Liverpool, the wife of Morris Paterson Jones, of a daughter.

MANDALE.—April 27, at Brixton, the wife of Joseph Mandale, solicitor, of a daughter.

PARKER.—April 17, at Kenyon House, Sheffield, the widow of the late Arnold Parker, solicitor, of a son.

ROBINSON.—April 25, at 22, Cambridge-square, the wife of W. F. Robinson, Q.C., of a son.

RUSSELL.—April 21, at 74, Harley-street, W., the wife of Charles Russell, Esq., Q.C., of a daughter.

SMITH.—April 18, at Ivy Bank, Beckenham, Kent, the wife of Horace Smith, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

VICKERY.—April 23, the wife of T. G. Vickery, solicitor, of a son.

WOOLF.—April 23, at 72, West Cromwell-road, South Kensington, the wife of Sydney Woolf, Esq., of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

COPE—WALKER.—April 26, at St. Peter's, Eaton-square, Thomas Cope, of Osbaston-hall, Leicestershire, and of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Alice Kate, daughter of the late George Walker, of Walthamstow, Essex.

COWARD.—MURDOCH.—April 16, at St. Saviour's, St. George's square, S.W., John Charles Lewis Coward, barrister-at-law, to Millicent Horatia, daughter of Sir Clinton Murdoch, K.C.M.G.

ELDRID—CAROZZI.—April 23, at St. John the Evangelist's, Duncan-terrace, Islington, Joseph Eldrid, of 8, Old Jewry, solicitor, to Josephine Mary, daughter of Giovanni Carozzi, of 28, Duncan-terrace, N.

MEWS—BAKER.—April 26, at Holy Trinity, Paddington, John Mews, barrister-at-law, to Edith Marion, daughter of the late William Baker.

MONRO—DINGWALL.—April 24, at St. Thomas', Portman-square, Alexander Monro, M.A., barrister-at-law, to Evelyn Agnes, daughter of the late A. Dingwall, of the Scottish Bar.

PAGE.—SHERIFF.—April 22, at St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Geo. Page, of Hay, Breconshire, solicitor, to Emily Clara, daughter of the late Alfred Sheriff, of Clifford.

PIGEON—ACLAND.—April 24, at Trinity Church, St. Marylebone, Henry Pigeon, of the Inner Temple, to Robina Harrison, daughter of Lawford Acland, of Langdown Lawn, Hythe, Hants.

POULTER.—TURRILL.—April 17, at the District Church of the Holy Trinity, Marylebone, Jonathan Holmes Poulter, barrister-at-law, of the Middle Temple, Esq., to Annie Sophia, daughter of the late John Turrill, Esq.

WAGGETT—BATLEY.—April 29, at St. John's Church, Nottingham, John Francis Waggett, B.A., barrister-at-law, to Edith Bonser, daughter of John Batley, of 7, Kensington-park-gardens, W.

DEATHS.

DEACON.—April 17, at Rectory-grove, Clapham, Henry Hodgkiss Deacon, late of Doctors'-commons, aged 67.

DE GEX.—April 16, Edward De Gex, of 20, Hyde-park-square, and 4, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn.

DOYLE.—April 27, at 8, Montpelier-villas, Cheltenham, Sir William Henry Doyle, Kt., Chief Justice of Gibraltar, aged 66.

LOW.—April 26, at 23, Douglas-road North, Canonbury, N., Mr. George West Low, for upwards of 60 years a clerk of Messrs. Dawes and Sons, 9, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street, aged 79.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, April 25, 1879.

Cosedge, Hiram, and Charles Allen Cosedge, Clifford's inn, Solicitors. Apr 12

Elmslie, J. F., Alexander Forsyth, Geo. A. Sedgwick, Graham Elmslie, and Gilbert H. Terrell, Leadenhall st. Solicitors. March 22

TUESDAY, Apr. 29, 1879.

Evans, John, and Edward Duncombe Eagles, John st, Bedford row. Feb 6

Wild, James Anstey, George Henley Barber, and George Richard Browne, Ironmonger lane, Solicitors. Apr 25

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, April 25, 1879.

Debuture Bond and Mortgage Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall, has fixed May 10 at 12 at his chambers as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

Engelbourns Slate Quarries, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Apr 22 directed to be heard before the M.R., on May 10. Roberts, Coleman st, solicitor for the petitioners

Liverpool and London Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated Mar 11, appointed Frederick Foster Buffon, Wool Exchange, Coleman st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required on or before May 31 to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Thursday, June 12 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

Seafire and Licensed Victuallers' and General Fire Insurance Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Monday, May 5 at 2, at his chambers as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

South Kensington Dairy Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Apr 24, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 3. Champion and Co, Ironmonger lane, solicitors for the petitioners

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, Apr. 29, 1879.

Land, Mortgage, and Savings' Bank, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Apr 9, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Harlow, Southampton buildings, solicitor for the petitioner

Saundersfoot and Tenby Collieries Company, Limited.—Creditors are required on or before May 23, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to Alfred Augustus James, Cannon st. Wednesday, June 11 at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the claims and claims.

Servian Copper and Iron Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Apr 23, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on May 9, Andrew, Clement's lane, solicitor for the petitioners.

Waterloo Club, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Apr 16, directed to be before V.C. Malins on May 9. Thomson and Ward, Bedford row, solicitors for the petitioner.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1879.

Manley Palace and Park Company, Limited.—The District Registrar has appointed May 5 at 11 at his chambers, Cross st, Manchester, to settle the list of contributors of the above company.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Apr. 26, 1879.

Benefit Society, Butchers' Arms, Carmarthen. Apr 21

Friendly Brothers' Benefit Society, Broad st, Ratcliff. Apr 22

Hand-in-Hand Friendly Society, Windmill Tavern, Nicholas lane, Cannon st. Apr 23

TUESDAY, Apr. 29, 1879.

Brecknock Christian United Society, British Schoolroom, Brecknock. Apr 24

Greenwich Union Benefit Society, White Swan, Greenwich road, Greenwich. Apr 25

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Apr. 11, 1879.

Alston, Robert Douglas, Tooting common, Merchant. Nov 3. V.C. Hall. Coward, Commercial Sale Rooms, Mincing lane

Billinghurst, Eliza Sophia, Cawley rd, Victoria Park. May 10. Billinghurst v. Billinghurst, V.C. Hall. Castle, Southampton st, Bloomsbury

Billinghurst, Onslow James, Whitechapel rd, Licensed Victualler. May 10. Billinghurst v. Billinghurst, V.C. Hall. Castle, Southampton st, Bloomsbury

Bruton, William Courtenay, Queen st, May Fair, Solicitor. May 19. Reilly v. Bruton, V.C. Hall. May, Russell sq

Chapman, John, Aylsham, Norfolk, Farmer. May 14. Roe v. Chapman, V.C. Hall. Woods, Norwich

Edwards, Robert, Bargo, Draper. May 12. Richardson v. Evans, M.R. Jones, Bangor

Howitt, John Bircmahaw, Heaton, Derby, Smallware Dealer. May 7. Quinton v. Gregory, V.C. Malins. Bell, Nottingham

Milne, Robert, Derby, Grocer. Apr 30. Milne v. Gandy, V.C. Bacon. Sale, Corn-market, Derby

Pinkerton, John Alfred, Treadley, Warwick. Apr 30. Wallace v. Pinkerton, V.C. Malins. Sharpe, Bedford row

Riches, Hurren, Clacton, Essex, B-ker. May 1. Jefferies v. Riches. V.C. Hall. Winter and Co, Bedford row

Wagstaff, Harriett, Long's ct, Leicester sq. May 9. Wagstaff v. Pearson M.R. Dowse, New Inn, Strand

Wentworth, John James, Bell lane, Wandsworth, Millwright. May 15. Sims v. Haldane, V.C. Hall. Jourdain, Ludgate hill

TUESDAY, April 15, 1879.

Dent, William, Casland Hotel, Victoria Park, Licensed Victualler. May 17. Dent v. Harden, V.C. Malins. Loxley, Cheapside

Drew, William, Bradninch, Devon, Paper Maker. May 15. Drew v. Drew, M.R. Deane, South sq, Gray's inn

Newton, William Edward, Norwich, Gent. May 14. Young v. Gallo-way, M.R. Flavel and Bowman, Bedford row

Pepperell, William Adams, Doodbrooke, Devon, Brewer. May 12. Pepperell v. Chamberlain, V.C. Bacon. Weymouth, Kingsbridge

Sims, Alfred, Horseferry rd, Earthenware Dealer. May 8. Sims v. Sims, V.C. Bacon. Kays and Jones, New Inn, Strand

Stevens, Sarah, John st, Edgware rd. May 15. Chesson v. Casbourn, V.C. Hall. Durant, New Windor

FRIDAY, Apr. 18, 1879.

Keay, George, West Bromwich, Builder. May 12. Bennett v. Keay. V.C. Bacon. Jaques, Birmingham

Norrish, Robert, Starcross, Devon, Gent. May 20. Norrish v. Huggins. Fry, J. Yarde, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn

TUESDAY, April 22, 1879.

Hardy, James, Clarence road, Wood green, Builder. May 15. Hardy v. Mapleton. V.C. Hall. Croft, Union court, Old Broad st

FRIDAY, Apr. 25, 1879.

Beavan, Samuel, Glascombe, Radnor, Esq. May 24. Beavan v. Beavan. V.C. Hall. Tatham and Procter, Lincoln's inn fields

Pickering, Ann, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. May 9. Wheatley v. Stephenson. V.C. Bacon. Forster, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Apr. 15, 1879.

Adcock, William, Syston, Leicester, Gent. June 18. Berridge and Morris, Leicester

Ashworth, James, Okeham, nr Manchester, Gent. May 23. Okell, Manchester

Band, Charles Edward, Combe Raleigh, Devon, Clerk. May 30. Turner, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Barnes, Mary, Sheffield. May 31. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield

Crane, John, Shepton Mallet, Somerset, Timber Merchant. May 31. Kilder, Shepton Mallet

Fish, William, Over Darwen, Tailor. May 1. Hindle, Over Darwen

George, William, Kingsland rd, Licensed Victualler. May 22. Pope, Gray's-inn-sq

Hucknall, William, Nottingham, Gent. May 20. Burton and Co, Nottingham

O'Neal, Theodore Whitfoot, Ingleisle, Beckenham, Kent, Esq. May 30. Turner, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Smith, Edmund James, Gloucester place, Portman sq, Esq. June 1. Neal, Finzer's Hall, Old Broad st

Thompson, Charlotte, Croydon, Surrey. May 30. Burton and Co, Nottingham

Williams, Mary Anne, Otterbourne, Hunts. June 2. Lempiere and Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Willis, Susan Dorothy, Sidcup, Kent. May 16. Gatliff and Howse, Finsbury-circus, London

FRIDAY, Apr. 18, 1879.

Arnold, James Emmerson, Walton-on-the-Naze, Essex. May 13. Tyrrell, Raymond-bldgs, Gray's-inn

Bethell, John, Farringdon-st, Undertaker. May 31. Gush and Phillips Finsbury-circus

Clarke, John, Long Satton, Lincoln, Gent. May 15. Mossop and Mossop, Long Satton

Cooke, Henry, Atherstone Warwick, Hat Manufacturer. May 14. Baxter, Atherstone

Damon, Henry, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Innkeeper. May 1. Urry, Ryde

Evans, Daniel William, Llanstephan, Carmarthen, Chemist. June 3. Thomas and Browne, Carmarthen

Evans, James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Smack Owner. June 12. Rolitt and Sons, Kingston-upon-Hull

Fisher, John, Lancaster, Innkeeper. June 3. Johnson and Tilly, Lancaster

Gale, Jeremiah, Old Sodbury, Gloucester, Labourer. June 4. Stone and Co, Bath

Goodson, Edward, St Peter the Apostle, Kent, Gent. July 6. Daniel Ramsgate

Lewis, John, Croesyceilog, Carmarthen, Land Surveyor. June 24. Thomas and Browne, Carmarthen

Lovegrove, Helen, Gt Marlow, Bucks. May 31. Rawson, Gt Marlow

Matthews, Frederick, Gunter-grove, Fulham rd, Licensed Victualler. May 19. Matthews, Gunter-grove

Moss, John Barrow, Liverpool, Gent. May 31. Barrow, Barrow-in-Furness

Owen, William, Withybus, Pembroke, Esq. July 1. Jenkinson and Co, Frederick's place, Old Jewry, London

Prior, William, Bath, Accountant. May 31. Ricketts, Bath

Reves, Edwin Alfred, Kingland-rd. July 19. Roy and Cartwright, Leobury

Robins, William, Bexley Heath, Kent, Esq. May 27. Pead, Parliament st, Westminster

Robinson, Mary, Jasmine st, Liverpool. May 8. Bell, West Hartlepool

Shutt, Isaac Thomas, Harrogate, York, Architect. July 14. Kirby and Son, Harrogate

Smith, George Leonard, St Edmunds, Millwall, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 17. Lickorish, Walbrook

Spencer, Henry John, Yemminster, Dorset, Gent. May 18. Ffooks, Sherburne

Spick, James, Box, Innholder. June 4. Stone and Co, Bath

Spriggs, James Robert, Bow Common-lane, Licensed Victualler. May 31. Beard and Sons, Basinghall st

Vokes, Samuel, Pecklington, Pork, Ironmonger. May 13. Holtby, York

Winterbottom, John, sen., Lees, Machine Broker. May 19. Tweedale and Co, Oldham

TUESDAY, Apr. 22, 1879.

Adams, Emma, Coleridge rd, Finsbury Park. June 2. Smallman, Queen st, London

Capes, John, Lonsdale sq, Barnsbury, Artists' Brush Manufacturer. June 1. Tanner, Circus-place, Finsbury-circus

Chambers, John, Faversham, Kent, Farmer. May 31. Tassell and Son, Faversham

Copley, George Edward, Potto Hall, York, Esq. June 27. Smithson and Son, York

Coward, Catherine, Brighton. June 24. Clarke and Co, Brighton

Devenham, Frederick, Warwick sq, Pimlico. May 28. Devenham, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Dirom, Robert, Queenstown, Ireland, Esq. July 31. Johnsons and Co, Austin Friars, London

Fawcett, Nanny, Smithy-in-Oakworth, York. May 16. Robinson and Robinson, Kelghley

Foster, John, Stainforth, York, Commission Agent. May 12. Robinson, Skipton

Furrell, Frederick, Sydenham, Kent, Esq. June 3. Rogers, Essex st, Strand

Gardner, John, West Derby, nr Liverpool, Gent. June 10. Weld, Liverpool

Gaffield, Matthew, Gloucester, Gent. May 31. Jones, Edon chambers, Gloucester

George, William, Ramsbury, Wilts, Yeoman. June 1. Rowland, Ramsbury

Gooch, James, Ipswich, Gent. June 1. Block, Ipswich

Hirst, Walter Oswald, Manchester, Merchant. May 29. Sale and Co, Manchester

Hoskin, Mary Ann, Brighton. June 24. Clarke and Co, Brighton

Huggett, Dennett, Lewes, Sussex, Pork Butcher. June 16. Hillman, Lewes

Humphreys, Charles, Litchurch, Derby, Gent. May 31. Sale and Mills

Huntly, Sarah Bellamy, Albert st, Regent's Park. June 3. Rogers, Essex st, Strand

Lane, Sarah, Cockfield, Sussex. May 26. Baker and Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London

Laport, Alexander Thomas, South Hill Park, Hampstead Heath. May 31. Prentice, Whitechapel rd

Lewis, John Nastedler, Monrovia in the Republic of Liberia. May 17. Tiller, Finsbury place, South, City

Lewis, Richard, Cliffe Pypard, Wilts, Farmer. May 3. Mullings and Co, Wootton Bassett

Lucas, Joseph, Cleve, Somerset, Esq. May 17. Woolfryes, Banwell

Millar, Charles, Penrhos, Carnarvon, M.D., J.P. June 1. Beyfus and Beyfus, Lincoln's inn fields

New, Jane, Cambridge terrace, Hyde Park. June 24. Hollowes and Co. Bedford row
 Pitcock, George, Deal, Kent. May 31. James Adley, Reeves, Herbert rd, Stockwell
 Riley, Samuel, Ilkeston, Derby, Coal Miner. June 4. Thornton, Ilkeston
 Saxton, Joseph, Gee Cross, Chester, Beer Retailer. June 24. Hibbert, Hyde
 Smith, Susannah, Margate, Kent. May 23. Tassell and Son, Faversham
 Stapley, Elizabeth, Brighton. June 16. Hillman, Lewes
 Sutton, Thomas Peter, Manor rd, Upper Lewisham rd, Commercial Traveller. May 31. Blackford and Co, College hill, Cannon st
 Thomas, William, Gloucester, Gent. May 31. Jones, Edon chambers, Gloucester
 Tyler, Jacob, Maresfield, Sussex, Farmer. June 16. Hillman, Lewes
 Westwell, Jane, Stalybridge, Chester. May 21. Buckley and Miller, Stalybridge
 Whitehead, John, Wardleworth, Lancaster, Woollen Manufacturer. May 31. Jackson, Rochdale
 Young, Arabella, Eastbourne, Sussex. June 7. Tison, Ilchester

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 25, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Clark, Thomas Henry, Beer lane, Great Tower st, Licensed Lighterman. Pet Apr 22. Murray. May 9 at 11.30
 Dyer, Henry, Brompton road, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet Apr 23. Brougham. May 6 at 1
 Godbold, Henry, Dances inn, Strand, Architect. Pet Apr 23. Brougham. May 6 at 12
 Ward, Josiah, Lichfield st, Soho, Builder. Pet Apr 22. Murray. May 9 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Arthur, James, Bristol, Mail-suer. Pet Apr 23. Harley. Bristol, May 7 at 2
 Barrett, John Holmes, Halifax, Brass Founder. Pet Apr 23. Rankin. Halifax, May 12 at 11
 Cotton, William, Eccleshall, Stafford, Farmer. Pet Apr 21. Spilbury. Stafford, May 12 at 12
 De Chair, Dudley Raikes, Broughton road, Ealing. Pet Apr 19. Ruston, jun. Brentford, May 6 at 10
 Glen, Charles, and Sidney John Forth, Kingston-upon-Hull, Cabinet Makers. Pet Apr 22. Rolitt. Kingston-upon-Hull, May 13 at 3
 Hunt, John William, James Henry Hunt, and William Benjamin Reynolds, jun, Wolverhampton, Silversmiths. Pet Apr 21. Sanders. Wolverhampton, May 7 at 2
 Massey, Richard, Hoobey, York, Farmer. Pet Apr 21. Wake. Sheffield, May 14 at 1
 Rees, William John, Swansea, Builder. Pet Apr 21. Jones. Swansea, May 7 at 2
 Shalders, Harry, Norwich, Tobacconist. Pet Apr 21. Cooke. Norwich, May 7 at 1

TUESDAY, Apr. 29, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cox, Thomas Henry, Blackfriars rd, Accountant. Pet Apr 24. Hazlitt. May 16 at 11
 Metcalfe, Richard, Paddington Green, Hydropathic Practitioner. Pet Apr 24. Hazlitt. May 14 at 11
 To Surrender in the Country.
 Burch, James, Southsea, Draper. Pet Apr 26. Howard. Portsmouth. May 21 at 12
 Dowey, Isabelle, Middlesborough, Innkeeper. Pet Apr 26. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, May 14 at 2.30
 Langford, James, Far, Cornwall, Butcher. Pet Apr 26. Chilcott. Truro, May 10 at 11
 Leitchfield, George, Waltham Abbey, Clerk. Pet Apr 3. Pulley. Edmonton, May 20 at 11
 Livesey, James Holland, Lower Broughton, Salford, Book-keeper. Pet Apr 26. Hulston. Salford, May 14 at 11
 Pearse, Frederick Edward, Pontypool, M.D. Pet Apr 26. Davis. Newport, May 16 at 2.30
 Sharp, Walter Josias, and John Shaw, Wakefield, Dyers. Pet Apr 23. Mason. Wakefield, May 14 at 3

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1879.

Gilbert, James, and Margaret Gilbert, Nowick, Sussex, out of business. Apr 25
 Scott, Gabriel, Redbridge, Southampton, Manure Merchant. Apr 8

**Liquidations by Arrangement.
FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, April 25, 1879.

Anderson, Michael, Dewsbury, Northumberland, Farmer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Brett, Bridge st, Morpeth
 Atkinson, Nathaniel, Middlesborough, Grocer. May 7 at 10 at offices of Catepole, Argyll buildings, Wilton st, Middlesborough
 Baker, Charles, Atherstone, Warwick, Miller. May 7 at 11 at offices of Powke, Ann st, Birmingham
 Baldwin, Anthony, Alderminster, Worcester, Farmer. May 7 at 3 at the Seven Stars Inn, Stratford-upon-Avon. Lane, Stratford-upon-Avon
 Ball, Noah, Oakengates, Salop, Beer-seller. May 16 at 11 at offices of Taylor, King st, Wellington
 Barker, George, Greasley, Nottingham, Beerhouse Keeper. May 9 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
 Barrow, Joseph, jun, Kendal, Brewer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Watson, Highgate, Kendal
 Beesley, Edwin, Dudley Port, Stafford, Victualler. May 6 at 3 at offices of Shelden, High st, Wellesbury
 Berridge, James William, Whittlesey, Cambridge, Butcher. May 9 at 12 at offices of Graves and Reeves, Whittlesey

Berriman, John, Laurence Pountney hill, Cannon st, Wine Merchant. May 9 at 3 at offices of Sweetland, Moorgate st
 Bianchi, John, and Mary Bianchi, Wolverhampton, Furniture Dealers. May 8 at 2.30 at the Peacock Hotel, Snow hill, Wolverhampton.
 Matthews and Smith, Birmingham
 Bishon, George, New Swindon, Wilts, Plumber. May 6 at 12 at offices of Ormond, Victoria st, Swindon
 Bolland, Thomas, Salford, Livery Stable Keeper. May 7 at 12 at offices of Blakeway, Deansgate, Manchester
 Bottomley, Thomas, Suddersfield, Green-grocer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Booth, John William st, Huddersfield
 Brain, Samuel, Mangotsfield, Gloucester, Grocer. May 3 at 11 at offices of Meeres, Nicholas st, Bristol
 Bucknall, William Henry, Bristol, Fishmonger. May 2 at 2 at offices of Clifton, Broad st, Bristol
 Butler, George Meecher, Eton, Bucks, out of business. May 8 at 2 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap
 Chalmers, Edward, Egmont, Cumberland, Draper. May 9 at 12 at offices of Atter, New Lowther st, Whitehaven
 Chandley, Robert, Cheshire, Builder. May 5 at 3 at offices of Newton, Bank chambers, Market place, Stockport
 Chapman, Frank, Clement's lane, Ship and Insurance Broker. May 7 at 2 at the Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Cheate, Henry, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire, Butcher. May 12 at 12 at the Milland Hotel, Station st, Burton-on-Trent. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent
 Clarke, John William, Nottingham, Hatter. May 5 at 11 at offices of Stevenson, Weekday cross, Nottingham
 Cleugh, James, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Drill Sergeant. May 10 at 11 at offices of Clark, Regent st, Cheltenham
 Cockitt, Thomas, Macclesfield, Printer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Froggatt, Chest rgate, Macclesfield
 Cogswell, Henry Dixon, Marquis terrace, Camden Town, Pawnbroker's Manager. May 21 at 2 at offices of George, Finsbury pl. Fenton, Highgate
 Cook, John, Shepton Mallet, Somerset, Cabinet Maker. May 14 at 3 at the George Hotel, Shepton Mallet. Nalder, Shepton Mallet
 Cook, Joseph, Sunderland, Grocer. May 7 at 11 at offices of Robinson, West Sunnyside, Sunderland
 Coop, John, Bolton, Rent Collector. May 15 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Bradshawgate, Bolton. Dowling and Urry, Bolton
 Coulthard, William Frankcom, Brighton, Haberdasher. May 10 at 11 at 145, Cheapside. Goodman, Brighton
 Coe, Stephen Fletcher, and Stephen Philip Guile Cox, Yatton, Somerset, Tanners. April 30 at 1 at offices of Brittan and Co, Small st, Bristol
 Crabbe, George, Manchester, Teacher of Dancing. May 17 at 3 at the Royal Oak Inn, Tamworth st, Hulme
 Daly, George Hickie, Chippenhams, Wilts, Surgeon. May 13 at 12 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Lincoln's inn fields. Phillips and Son, Chippenhams
 Davies, George, Aberystwyth, Innkeeper. May 15 at 11 at 11, Frogmore st, Aberystwyth. Hodgkins
 Deane, Francis William, Birmingham, Hosier. May 6 at 11 at offices of Rooke, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Douthwaite, John Brigham, Swine, York, Veterinary Surgeon. May 5 at 3 at offices of Summers, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Eccles, William Henry, Over Darwen, Lancaster, Coal Agent. May 7 at 3 at offices of Polding, Tackett's st, Blackburn
 Ellis, Charles, Nottingham, Earthenware Dealer. May 12 at 11 at offices of Heath and Son, St Peter's Churchwalk, Nottingham
 Ellis, Robert, Buckley, Flint, Butcher. May 7 at 3 at offices of Roberts, Wrexham st, Mold
 Evans, David Jenkyn, Pen-y-graig, Glamorgan, Draper. May 8 at 2 at offices of Hunt and Co, Nicholas st, Manchester. Morgan, Pontypridd
 Evans, Enoch, Burntwood, Licensed Victualler. May 7 at 11 at offices of Ebbworth, Bridge st, Wednesbury
 Farrow, Charles, Rosedale, nr Pickering, out of business. May 9 at 2 at the Crown Hotel, Rosedale. Harrison, Kirby Moorside
 Felton, Thomas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. May 14 at 2 at offices of Middlemiss and Pearce, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Fisher, Daniel, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, Farmer. May 13 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham
 Fisher, John, Blackpool, Coal Merchant. May 7 at 3 at offices of Storey, Market st, Blackpool
 Fletcher, Charles Robert, Manchester, Leather Merchant. May 7 at 2 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds
 Funnell, Daniel, S. xmundham, Suffolk, Harness Maker. May 9 at 2 at Pearce's Rooms, Princes st, Ipswich. Jennings, Ipswich
 Gattie, William, St Mary's rd, Peckham, Gentleman. May 12 at 3 at offices of Haigh and Agar, Greenham st
 Gillum, Alfred William, Cobnash, Hereford, Machinist. May 8 at 1.30 at offices of Edwards and Weaver, Leominster. Garrold, Hereford
 Glover, Walter T wias, and George Stephenson, Manchester, Wholesale H siers. May 13 at 2 at offices of Addieshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester
 Gold, Richard, Solihull, nr Birmingham, Hinge Manufacturer. May 8 at 11 at the Acon Hotel, Temple st, Birmingham. East, Birmingham
 Greenley, Robert, Filey, York, Innkeeper. May 7 at 3 at offices of Richardson, Market place, Bridlington
 Gregson, Edward, Mount Pleasant, Bradford, Fancy Box Maker. May 13 at 11 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly chambers, Piccadilly, Bradford
 Griffiths, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Tin Manufacturer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Grindrod, Benjamin Robert, Rochdale, Organ Builder. May 6 at 2.30 at offices of Brierley, Butt's avenue, Rochdale
 Groenings, Franz, Middlesborough, Music Seller. May 5 at 11 at offices of Van Sandan and Cumming, King st, Cheapside, London. Belk and Farrington, Middlesborough
 Guy, Frederick Charles, Birmingham, House Painter. May 7 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Haliday, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Wine Merchant. May 13 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Co, St. John's chambers, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Hall, Charles, Liverpool, Tobacconist. May 12 at 2 at offices of Morris and Jones, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Harrison, George, Burnley, Grocer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Nordon and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Harrison, Joseph, Bernard Castle, Durham, Grocer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Harrison, Samuel, Leicester, Wheelwright. May 9 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Co, Grey Friars chambers, Friar lane, Leicester
 Haworth, Richard, Blackburn, Draper. May 8 at 3 at offices of Holland, Northgate, Blackburn
 Heather, Thomas, Watford, Hertford, Schoolmaster. May 6 at 4 at the Masonic Hall, Watford. Sedgwick and Turner
 Heslop, Mary, Sunderland, Ironmonger. May 6 at 11 at offices of Alcock, Jun, Frederick Lodge, Sunderland
 Hirst, George, Leeds, Dyer. May 8 at 11 at offices of Ford and Warren, Albion st, Leeds
 Hogg, Charles, sen, Linton, York, Farmer. May 8 at 4 at the Angel Hotel, Wetherby. Coates and Son, Wetherby
 Hogg, Charles, Jun, Linton, York, Farmer. May 8 at 4.30 at the Angel Hotel, Wetherby. Coates and Son, Wetherby
 Horg, George, Low Walker, Northumberland, Grocer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Stanford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Holland, John, Stroud, Gloucester, Grocer. May 5 at 11 at Ram Hotel, Gloucester. Smith and Stafford, Stroud
 Holmes, Jane, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. May 6 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Barrall, Albion st, Leeds
 Hooper, James Humphrey Singleton, Dulwich, Retired Paymaster R.N. May 7 at 11 at offices of Heritage and Co, Nicholas lane
 Howell, Edward, Tynewydd, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. May 9 at 11 at Castle Inn, Bridgend. Randall, Bridgend
 Hyland, John, Birmingham, Provision Dealer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Hodson and Haigh, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 James, Evan, Heath Town near Wolverhampton, Builder. May 8 at 11 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Jones, David, Machynlleth, Montgomery, Draper. May 9 at 1 at Town-hall, Aberystwyth. Davies, Dolegely
 Jones, William Henry, Raiton road, Brighton, Boot Manufacturer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Stear and Knight, Basinghall st. Mason, North buildings, Finsbury
 Kirrage, Joseph, Old Windsor, Berks, Builder. May 12 at 3 at offices of Phillip, Sheet st, Windsor
 Knappion, John, Cleckheaton, York, Stiff Manufacturer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Harris and Holistone, Market st, Bradford
 Kneel, Thomas, Stroud, Gloucester, General Leather Merchant. May 15 at 12 at Incorporated Law Society, Chancery lane. Warman
 Lawrenson, James, Liverpool, Builder. May 15 at 2 at offices of Deane York buildings, Dale st, Liverpool
 Ledbury, John, Trowbridge, Wilts, Carpenter. May 7 at 12 at offices of Rodway, Fore st, Trowbridge
 Leech, George Frederick, Crewe, Chester, Beer Retailer. May 5 at 11 at Cheese Hall Vaults, Crewe. Pounton, Crewe
 Levings, Arthur, Brighton, House Decorator. May 12 at 12 at offices of Edmonds and Co, Chesapeake, London. Lamb and Evest, Brighton
 Levinson, Fisher, Leeds, Tailor. May 6 at 3 at offices of Billinton, Bank st, Leeds
 Lewis, Mary, David Lewis, Howell Lewis, and Joseph Lewis, Fern-dale, Glamorgan, Grocers. May 10 at 12 at offices of Rosser, High st, Pontypridd
 Limpriest, Charles Latly, and William Coulson, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Shipbrokers. May 12 at 11 at Incorporated Law Society, Royal arcade, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Ingledew, Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Lindon, John Lidstone, Sherford, Devon, Farmer. May 6 at 3.30 at King's Arms Hotel, King-bridge. Hurrell, Kingsbridge
 Linon, Thomas Kevenhuller, Canterbury, Furniture Dealer. May 9 at 3 at Fleur de Lis Hotel, Canterbury. Plummer and Fildings, Canterbury
 Lucas, John, and Robert Abner Lucas, Donstan, Durham, Fire Brick Manufacturers. May 15 at 11 at Incorporated Law Society, Royal arcade, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Philipon, Newcastle-on-Tyne
 Luxton, Thomas, Yeovil, Somerset, Innkeeper. May 6 at 12 at Chard road Railway Hotel, near Chard. Jeffery, Ottery St Mary
 Manners, John, Ossett, York, Dealer in Ragdust. May 12 at 3 at offices of Stringer, Prospect place, Ossett
 Manners, John, Ilkeston, Derby, Builder. May 7 at 11 at St John Warren's Hotel, Ilkeston. Garthwaite, Manchester
 Metcalf, John, and John Livesey, Manchester, Merchants. May 12 at 3 at Mitre Hotel, Cathedral gates, Manchester. Cooper and Sons, Manchester
 Merrikin, William, Louth, Lincoln, Auctioneer. May 9 at 11 at offices of Grange and Winttingham, St Mary's chambers, West St Mary's gate, Great Grimsby
 Mole, Thomas Harry, Birmingham, no occupation. May 8 at 12 at offices of Hodgson and Haigh, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 Morgan, Gregory, Caerphilly, Glamorgan, Butcher. May 12 at 12 at offices of Langley, St Mary st, Cardiff
 Nancarrow, John, and John Lidney Nancarrow, Grampond, Cornwall, Tanners. May 6 at 3 at offices of Hodge and Co, Pydar st, Truro
 Nash, Charles, Horwylth, Hereford, out of business. May 6 at 12.30 at offices of Garrod, Widemarsh st, Hereford
 Newman, John Harding, sen, Mayall road, Brixton, out of business. May 8 at 3 at Old King's Head Hotel, Borough High st. Rashleigh, Borough High st
 Nicholson, Peter, Cleator Moor, Cumberland, Tailor. May 7 at 2 at Globe Hotel, Whitehaven. Whittle, Cleator Moor
 Norman, Alfred Henry Tuff, Twa' st, Bethnal Green, Upholsterer. May 14 at 3.30 at 1, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Miller and Miller, Sharnbrook lane
 North, Benjamin, sen, and Benjamin North, Jun, Bradford, Coal Merchants. May 9 at 11 at offices of Fox, Hustler gate, Bradford
 Nutt, Moses, Goodramgate, York, Saddler. May 12 at 11 at offices of Young, Low Ousegate, York
 Osborn, Joseph, Bradford, Boot Manufacturer. May 14 at 11 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford
 Pass, Joseph, and Frederick Knight, Birmingham, both out of business. May 8 at 3 at offices of Higgs, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Pearson, John Swift, Cernhill, Marine Insurance Broker. April 28 at 4 at offices of Miller and Son, Leadenhall st

Pearson, Thomas, Halifax, Linen Draper. May 14 at 11 at the Old Cock Hotel, Halifax. Emmott and Walker, Halifax
 Pickett, David, Stockton-on-Tees, Boot Manufacturer. May 5 at 1 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Hutton and Bolsover, Stockton-on-Tees
 Pittaway, William, Gloucester, Baker. May 7 at 3 at offices of Haines, Westgate chambers, Berkeley st, Gloucester
 Player, John, Bristol, Wine Merchant. May 6 at 1.30 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Miller, Bristol
 Player, Thomas, Bristol, Wine Merchant. May 6 at 1 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Miller, Bristol
 Pole, Samuel, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. May 8 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Co, Grey Friars chambers, Friar lane, Leicester
 Prior, Stephen, Union st, Old Broad st, Silk Broker. May 8 at 2 at 4, Union st, Old Broad st. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Rayner, Job Sykes, Eastrick, York, Grocer. May 9 at 11 at the Star Inn, Bridge End, Eastrick. Craven and Sunderland, Brighouse
 Reddrop, William Joseph, Trowbridge, Wilts, Cloth Merchant. May 5 at 2 at offices of Pitt, St John st, Bristol. Rodway, Trowbridge
 Redhead, Peter, Lindale-in-Furness, Lancaster, Farmer. May 9 at 11 at the Temperance Hall, Ulverston. Atkinson, Ulverston
 Ridler, James, High Wycombe, Printer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Parker and Son, Easton st, High Wycombe
 Robinson, Edward, Sheffield, Painter. May 10 at 11 at offices of Porrett, Bank st, Sheffield
 Robinson, Frederick, High st, Uxbridge, Oilman. May 7 at 4 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside. Lay, Town-hall, Brentford
 Rook, Richard George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Dealer. May 7 at 2 at 33, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Richardson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Rodkin, Joseph, Great Grimsby, Lincoln, Builder. May 9 at 12 at offices of Grange and Winttingham, St Mary's chambers, West St Mary's gate, Great Grimsby
 Rumens, Moses, Teeburst, Sussex, Farmer. May 8 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Hawkhurst. Meadows and Elliott
 Russell, Thomas, Ledbury, Hereford, Miller. May 9 at 12 at the Feathers Hotel, Ledbury. Masefield and Sons, Ledbury
 Rutherford, John, Hexham, Northumberland, Plumber. May 15 at 12 at offices of Lockhart, Hexham
 Sanders, Henry, Primrose st, Bishopsgate without, Furniture Manufacturer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Mogg, Sacredita High st. Noon and Clarke, Blomfield st
 Sandwick, William, West Hartlepool, Builder. May 10 at 11 at offices of Wilson, Church st, West Hartlepool
 Schramm, Emil, Birmingham, Toy Manufacturer. May 7 at 3 at the Grand Hotel, Colmore row, Birmingham. Edwards
 Shackleton, Stephen, and John Hudson, Bradford, Stiff Manufacturers. May 12 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford
 Slater, James, Worsborough Bridge, York, Boot Maker. May 14 at 10 at offices of Rideal, Chronicle chambers, Barmsey
 Smith, Edward West, Gloucester, Corn Merchant. May 2 at 3 at offices of Haines, Westgate chambers, Berkeley st, Gloucester
 Soar, William Henry, Vauxhall Bridge rd, House Painter. May 3 at 11 at offices of Wells, St Martin's st, Leicester st
 Stacey, Charles, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler. May 9 at 11 at offices at offices of Mellor, Queen st, Sheffield
 Statham, George William, Leicester, Leather Merchant. May 12 at 3 at offices of Harvey, Sherborne buildings, Millstone lane, Leicester
 Stephenson, James, Seaton, York, Farmer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Bainton, Lair Gate, Beverley
 Stockwell, Thomas, Jun, Ardwick, Lancaster, Corn Dealer. May 15 at 3 at 3 at offices of Chorlton, Branscombe st, Manchester
 Swift, John, Clogher, Wigan. May 8 at 10.30 at offices of Wilson, King st, Wigan
 Syson, Arthur James, and Ruth Syson, Birmingham, Importers of Geneva Watches. May 9 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Taylor, Charles Henry, South Retford, Nottingham, out of business. May 12 at 11 at offices of Marshall, Chapel gate, East Retford
 Metcalfe, East Retford
 Taylor, Samuel, Knut-ford, Chester, Farmer. May 8 at 3 at offices of McEwen, Lloyd st, Manchester
 Taylor, William, Newton Abbot, Devon, Butcher. May 14 at 11 at Mayor's Commercial Hotel, Newton Abbot. Mackenzie and Hext, Torquay
 Thompson, William Dewsey, Great Yarmouth, Shoeing Smith. May 7 at 3 at offices of Diver, King st, Great Yarmouth
 Timperley, Walter, Sheffield, Hotel Keeper. May 9 at 3 at offices of Machen, Bank st, Sheffield
 Titmas, Samuel, Cranfield, Bedford, Baker. May 8 at 11 at offices of Conquest and Clare, Duke st, Bedford
 Toddington, Isaac, Mardol, Shrewsbury, Licensed Victualler. May 5 at 2 at offices of Chandler, Talbot chambers, Shrewsbury
 Toovey, Samuel, Amerham, Bucks, Chair Maker. May 10 at 3 at the King's Arms Inn, Amerham. Green and Cheese, Warwick st, Charing Cross
 Wake, Tom, Stockton-on-Tees, Provision Dealer. May 5 at 11 at offices of Best, Market Cross chambers, Stockton-on-Tees
 Wale, William, Bath, Butcher. May 7 at 11 at offices of Bartrum, Northumberland buildings, Bath
 Walker, John, Birmingham Draper. May 7 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
 Warner, Francis John, Leicester, Furniture Dealer. May 12 at 2.30 at offices of Wright and Hincks, Belvoir st, Leicester
 Washer, James, Bristol, General-shop Keeper. May 15 at 12 at offices of Shiner, Victoria st, Bristol. Woolfryes, Banwell
 Watson, Arthur, Sheffield, Commission Agent. May 8 at 11 at offices of Senior, Regent st, Barnsley
 Watson, Walter, sen, Edward Askew, and Walter Watson, Jun, Birmingham, Printers. May 7 at 12 at offices of Jagger, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Wearn, William Henry, Mount Ephraim, Kent, Fruiterer. May 7 at 12 at the Camden Hotel, Tunbridge Wells. Andrew and Chasle, Tunbridge Wells
 Webster, Henry, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Ironmonger. May 12 at 2 at the Midland Hotel, Burton-on-Trent. Hextall, Derby

Weich, Samuel Smith, Stockton-on-Tees, Engineer. May 13 at 3 at offices of Dadds and Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees.
Westcott, George, Harrow rd, Grocer. May 6 at 2 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, King st, Chesapeake. Terry, King at Wharmby, James, New Mills, Derby, Furniture Dealer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Gardner, Cooper at, Manchester.
Whistler, John, Curdiss, Tailor. May 8 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff.
White, George, Upper Parkstone, Dorset, Coal Dealer. May 12 at 1 at offices of Wade, The Arcade, Bournemouth.
Wilkinson, Richard Henry, Bradford, York, Draper. May 9 at 3 at the Creditors' Association, Parkinson's chambers, Market st, Bradford.
Williams, William, Wrexham, Denbigh, Beerhouse Keeper. May 8 at 3 at offices of Sherratt, Regent st, Wrexham.
Williamson, Hedworth, St Julian, Norwich, Gentleman. May 12 at 11 at offices of Sade and Linsay, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich. Howlett, Wymondham.
Wingfield, John, Brighton, Hairdresser. May 9 at 3 at offices of Lamb and Erett, Ship st, Brighton.
Worgan, George, Gloucester, Office house Man. May 3 at 11 at offices of Longley, Westgate chambers, Berkeley st, Gloucester.
Wormold, William, Rawdon, York, Terra Cotta Manufacturer. May 5 at 2 at the Law Institution, Albion place, Leeds. Dibb and Co.
Yorke, Sarah, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. May 7 at 3 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1879.

Alford, James, Jun, Melleerthyan, Glamorgan, Marine Store Dealer. May 10 at 11 at offices of Davies, Alma place, Neath.
Aston, Benjamin, Preston, Glass Dealer. May 15 at 12 at offices of Charney and Finch, Fox st, Preston.
Auld, William, Darlington, Durham, General Smith. May 13 at 10.30 at offices of Wooller, Priestgate, Darlington.
Banks, Thomas, Henall, York, Farmer. May 16 at 11 at offices of Eastham, Church at, Clitheroe.
Barker, George, Greas-ley, Nottingham, Beerhouse keeper. May 15 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham.
Bateman, Richard Bird, Manchester, Mourning Warehouseman. May 22 at 3 at offices of Farrer and Hall, Fountain st, Manchester.
Batty, James, Sillington, York, Farmer. May 10 at 12 at offices of Gramble, Stonegate, York. Robinson and Son, Eastingwold.
Berman, Abraham, Chalfont Bar, Nottingham, Tailor. May 14 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham.
Best, William Martin, Stockton-on-Tees, Solicitor. May 12 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees.
Betteridge, William Harper, Ancester terrace, Peechham, Grocer. May 15 at 2 at offices of Matthews and Wells, John st, Bedford row.
Devan, John Saxe, Ifracombe, Devon, Baker. May 13 at 12.30 at offices of Chanter and Co, Bridge Hall chambers, Barnstaple.
Birch, Levi, Chesham, Buckingham, Boot Manufacturer. May 13 at 2 at offices of Francis and How, Chesham.
Boekcher, Clever, Alxander Adolph, Houndsditch, Toy Merchant. May 7 at 3 at offices of Cannon, King st, Chesapeake.
Brown, Francis, Modbury, Devon, Baker. May 9 at 12 at offices of Pearce, Princess sq, Plymouth.
Brown, William, Ball's Pond rd, Draper. May 12 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd. Cooper, Chancery lane.
Dunhill, Edwin Augustus, Lower Thames st, Accountant. May 10 at 3 at offices of Angove, Serjeant's inn, Fleet st.
Butler, Caroline Jane, Great Yarmouth, Cabinet Maker. May 15 at 12 at offices of Burton and Son, King st, Great Yarmouth.
Campbell, John, Darlington, Durham, Architectural Modeller. May 6 at 10.30 at offices of Wooller, Priestgate, Darlington.
Cawthray, Elijah, Tong, York, Cartier. May 12 at 3 at offices of Beverley, Hustlegate, Bradford.
Chilton, James, Stone, Stafford, Boot Manufacturer. May 14 at 11 at the Crown Hotel, Stone. Ashwell, Stoke-upon-Trent.
Christie, Thomas, Milom, Cumberland, Draper. May 9 at 3 at the Trade Association, York st, Manchester. Dickinson, Broughton-in-Furness.
Clark, George, Sunderland, Hostler. May 12 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland.
Clements, John, Epsom, Surrey, Baker. May 13 at 3 at offices of Wolfstan and Co, Ironmonger lane, Chesapeake.
Cooksey, Joseph, New-town, Stafford, Beerhouse keeper. May 9 at 3 at offices of Smith, Walsall st, Wednesday.
Cork, John, Holborn, South Shields, Grocer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Mahane, Barrington st, South Shields.
Cox, George, Maids Moreton, Buckingham, out of business. May 17 at 11 at offices of Small, Buckingham. Kilby and Mace, Banbury.
Cox, Stephen Fitchew, Fitzshew Cox, and George Chapman, Leeds, Leather Factors. May 9 at 12 at offices of Rooks and Midgley, White Horse st, Bear lane.
Crisp, Charles, Eastbourne, Sussex, Draper. May 14 at 12 at 145, Chesapeake. Carr and Co, Basinghall st.
Cuffing, Richard, Accrington, Lancashire, Tailor. May 13 at 11 at the Thatched House Hotel, Market st, Manchester. Haworth and Broughton, Accrington.
Davey, John Veale, Plymouth, Fancy Dealer. May 10 at 12 at offices of Bridgman, Princess sq, Plymouth.
Davies, Amriah Robert, Pontytrall, Carnarvon, Draper. May 16 at 12 at the Queen's Commercial Hotel, Chester. Owen, Carnarvon.
Davies, James, Bridging, Glamorgan, Painter. May 13 at 2 at offices of Stockwood, Jon, Towall chambers, Bridging.
De Frees, Isaac, Liverpool, Outfitter. May 15 at 3 at offices of Nordon and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool.
De Pinna, Amelia, and Letitia De Pinna, Old Kent rd, Ostleth Feather Manufacturers. May 14 at 11 at offices of Coker, Chesapeake. Henderson, Gresham house, Old Broad st.
Evans, John, Morriston, nr Swansea, Clerk. May 12 at 3 at offices of Jellison, Prospect place, Swansea.
Evans, Robert Richards, Bangor, Carnarvon, Draper. May 15 at 2 at offices of Joselyne and Co, King st, Chesapeake. Phelps and Co, Gresham st.
Fairchild, Thomas, Swansea, Butcher. May 19 at 3 at offices of Woodward, Wind st, Swansea.
Fisher, John Clay, Kirby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, Farmer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham.

Fleet, William Henry, West Malvern, Worcester, Chemist. May 7 at 11 at offices of Carbeck, Avenue House, the Cross, Worcester.
Gardiner, Thomas Edmund, Mile End rd, Anstoner. May 14 at 3 at offices of Farnell, Fenchurch st.
Geach, George Edmund, Tranno st, Trimming Merchant. May 9 at 3 at offices of Holder, King st, Chesapeake.
Gerard, Gaston, Cardiff, Chemist. May 7 at 2 at offices of Tribe and Co, Moorgate st buildings, Moorgate st. Downing and Price, Cardiff.
Grace, James, Hertford, Boot Maker. May 8 at 4 at the George Hotel, Luton. Cooper, Chancery lane.
Grant, Duncan, Tavannes, Pembroke, Grocer. May 10 at 21 at offices of Lascelles, Northth.
Graves, Robert, Ashby-de-la-Laund, Lincoln, Farmer. May 12 at 11 at offices of Tweed and Co, Saltorgate.
Green, John, Birmingham, Tailor. May 15 at 12 at the Acorn Hotel, Temple st, Birmingham. Collis, Stourbridge.
Green, John Alexander, Nantwich, Cheshire, Joiner. May 10 at 10 at offices of Hill, Coppenthall terrace, Crewe.
Gregory, Joseph, Harpurhey, nr Manchester, Fruiterer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Lawson, Peter st, Manchester.
Hackney, Alfred Herbert, Warbleton, Sussex, Surgeon. May 14 at 12 at the George Hotel, Battle, Shephard, Battle.
Halstead, David, Red Bank, Manchester, Worsted Dyer. May 14 at 3 at Rylands, Essex st, Manchester.
Harris, Richard, Neath, Glamorgan, Boot Manufacturer. May 13 at 11 at offices of Scales, Orchard place, Neath.
Harrison, Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, Boot Maker. May 10 at 1.30 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds.
Hayward, George, Bristol, Green Grocer. May 9 at 12 at offices of Triggs, Broad st, Bristol. Benson and Carpent r, Bristol.
Henshall, Joseph, Altrincham, Cheshire, Ironmonger. May 13 at 3 at offices of Nicholls and Co, Market st, Altrincham.
Herbert, Daniel, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. May 14 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne buildings, Milstone lane, Leicester.
Higgin, Elizabeth Bella, Burnley, Lancashire, Saddler. May 12 at 3 at the Exchange Hotel, N.choles st, Burnley. Sutcliffe, Burnley.
Higgin, Richard Charles, Doynton, Gloucester, Farmer. May 10 at 2 at offices of Gill and Bush, Miles's buildings, Bath.
Hooder, Jacob, Wetherall, Cumberland, Husbandman. May 16 at 2.30 at offices of Armiton, St Andrew's place, Penrith.
Hurrocks, James, jun, and Charles Edward Hurrocks, Manchester, Furniture Manufacturers. May 9 at 11 at offices of Tremewen, Market st, Manchester.
Hunsell, Charles William, Fish st hill, Coffee house Keeper. May 12 at 12 at offices of Robinson, Philpot lane, Fenchurch st.
Howard, Hugh, Southport, Tailor. May 19 at 3 at offices of Hinde and Co, Mount st, Manchester.
Howell, George William, Greenheys, Manchester, Traveller. May 9 at 3 at offices of Beaumont and Richards, Booth st, Manchester.
Howie, Henry, Smallthorne, Stafford, Stationer. May 8 at 11 at offices of Julian, Queen's chambers, Liverpool rd, Barleas.
Hubbard, Joseph, Ashwell rd, Bow, Fancy Box Manufacturer. May 8 at 11 at the Crown Hotel, Old Ford rd. Hicks, Grove rd, Victoria park.
Hutt, Phillin, Kentish Town rd, Manager to a Fancy Draper. May 12 at 3 at offices of Matthews and Wells, John st, Bedford row.
Ingham, William, Leeds, Grocer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Billinton, Bank st, Leeds.
Jobson, Edward Charles, and Johann Christian Wilhelm Bervan, West Hartlepool, Timber Merchants. May 26 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hartlepool.
Johnson, Charles, Kidsgrove, Stafford, Tailor. May 12 at 3 at the Roebuck Hotel, Kidsgrove. Wile, Kidsgrove.
Johnson, William Andrew, 114 eq, York, Grocer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Burton, Parkinson's chambers, Market st, Bradford. Brumfit, Holey.
Jones, William, Dover, Carrier. May 14 at 12 at offices of Lovering and Co, Gresham st. Mowll, Dover.
Kay, Stephen, Bolton, Provision Dealer. May 9 at 3 at offices of Whittingham, Exchange st, Mawley st, Bolton.
Klyne, Richard William, Gateshead, Hatter. May 13 at 3 at the Law Society, Arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Fenwick, Jarrow-on-Tyne.
Lawrence, James, Birmingham, Ashpan Maker. May 10 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham.
Lawrenson, Thomas, Preston, Saddler. May 15 at 3 at offices of Thompson, Lane st, Preston.
Lewis, Jacob, Mildmay rd, no occupation. May 12 at 3 at offices of Green, Queen st.
Lightbourne, William Ashbourne, Blackburn, General Medical Practitioner. May 13 at 11 at offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn.
Lister, Joseph, Rotherham, Builder. May 13 at 11 at offices of Willis, Church st, Rotherham.
Lloyd, William, Kirby Boliars, Leicester, Farmer. May 13 at 4 at the Harborough Hotel, Melton Mowbray. Dowson and Wright.
Macnamara, Joseph, Strand, Cutler. May 7 at 8 at 15, Beaufort buildings, Strand. Butterfield, Ironmonger lane.
Meadows, James Pope, Dover, Furniture Dealer. May 14 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, London. Cardor, Dover.
Medcalf, John, and John Livesey, Manchester, Merchant. May 15 at 3 at offices of Cooper and Sons, King st, Manchester.
Moore, Jonas, Manchester, Merchant. May 21 at 3 at offices of Rylands, Essex st, Manchester.
Moss, Benjamin, Charlton, Northampton, Farmer. May 16 at 3 at offices of Pearce and Taylor, Bridge st, Banbury.
Moss, Thomas William, Usmark villas, Ealing, Clerk. May 14 at 3 at offices of Hogan and Hughes, St Martin's lane, Cannon st.
Moverley, Henry, Ordsall, Nottingham, Ironkeeper. May 13 at 11 at offices of Marshall, Chapel gate, East R.ifford.
Nathan, Nathaniel, High st, Shorelitch, Tailor. May 20 at 3 at offices of Goldberg and Langdon, West st, Finchbury street.
Neale, William, Barton-on-Treat, Grocer. May 12 at 11 at the Midland Hotel, Station st, Barton-on-Treat. Taylor, Barton-on-Treat.
Neave, Henry, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincoln, Engineer. May 14 at 12.30 at offices of Mason, Whitecross st, Barton-upon-Humber.

Osborne, John, Brampton, Cumberland, Draper. May 12 at 3 at offices of Carrick and Co, Brampton

Paling, Frederick, Castle terrace, Acton, Grocer. May 12 at 4 at offices of Harvey, Basinghall st. Lay, Staple Inn

Park, William, Lower Broughton, Lancashire, Dealer in Watches. May 10 at 11 at office of Vaughan-Jones, Bridge st, Manchester

Parker, John Garner, Dalston, Pawnbroker. May 10 at 10.30 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wadsworth

Partridge, Alfred Munden, Wadsworth rd, Boot Manufacturer. May 8 at 3 at offices of Mooley, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq

Payne, William, and Thomas Robert Kenneth, High Holborn, Dealers in Toys. May 13 at 2 at the Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st. Gush and Phillips, Finsbury circus

Pickering, Edwin, Sparkbrook, Warwick, Commission Merchant. May 16 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Bagnall, Colmore row, Birmingham

Pickles, John, Eastborough, York, Greengrocer. May 16 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Union st, Dewsbury

Pinches, Thomas, Walsall, Builder. May 10 at 11 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham

Price, Thomas, Jun, Nantgarw, Glamorgan, Miller. May 13 at 12 at offices of Rosser, High st, Newport

Price, William, Newport, Mon, Builder. May 16 at 12 at offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport

Proctor, David, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Joiner. May 12 at 12 at offices of Griffith, Lad lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Pugh, Mary, and Emily Sue Cootman, Liverpool, Milliners. May 13 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, Liverpool

Randall, Emmanuel, Romsey, Southampton, Leather Board Manufacturer. May 12 at 3 at the Red Lion Hotel, Basingstoke. West, Queen Victoria st

Revell, John Aldridge, Union st, Victoria Docks, Grocer. May 13 at 1 at offices of Willis, Charles sq, Hoxton

Regers, Thomas, West Bromwich, Fruiterer. May 13 at 11.30 at offices of Jackson, High st, West Bromwich

Solemon, Adolphe, Southampton row, Dealer in Works of Art. May 9 at 11 at offices of Howard and Co, New Bridge st

Sait, Nehemiah, Hanley, Beer-seller. May 8 at 11 at offices of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley

Schofield, James, Stratford, Essex, Lucifer Match Manufacturer. May 9 at 2 at offices of Biggenden, Finsbury sq buildings, Finsbury sq

Shakemshaft, Charles, Liverpool, Cart Owner. May 16 at 3 at offices of Norton and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool

Sheppard, Thomas, Shaftesbury terrace, Hornsey rise, Fishmonger. May 7 at 12 at offices of Brown and Sons, Finsbury pl

Simcox, William, Hedgesford, Stafford, Contractor. May 12 at 3.30 at the Swan Hotel, Stafford

Smith, Alexander, Bulman's village, Northumberland, Schoolmaster. May 16 at 3 at offices of Legge and Denison, Mosley st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Smith, Harry Eden, Great Lever, Lancashire, Boot Maker. May 13 at 11 at offices of Healy, Acresfield, Bolton. Balshaw, Bolton

Southern, Mark, Bolton, Bone Dealer. May 7 at 3 at offices of Robinson, Townhall sq, Bolton

Stone, Samuel, St George, Gloucester, Builder. May 13 at 11 at offices of Atchley, Clare st, Bristol

Summers, George, Claines, Worcester, Shopkeeper. May 10 at 12 at offices of Corbett, Avenue house, The Cross, Worcester

Talbot, James Edward, Cardiff, Upholsterer. May 14 at 11 at offices of Jones, Philharmonic chambers, Cardiff

Tamlyn, Christopher, Swansea, Licensed Victualler. May 8 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York pl, Swansea

Tattershall, Edward George, Great James st, Bedford row, Solicitor. May 15 at 3 at offices of Lawrence and Co, Old Jewry chambers

Teller, Archibald, Rev, Nottingham. May 13 at 4 at offices of Cockayne, Fletcher gate, Nottingham

Thorpe, William, Boston, Lincoln, Innkeeper. May 12 at 12 at the Red Lion Hotel, Boston. Bales, Boston

Vaughan, Abolam, East Dean, Gloucester. May 13 at 3 at offices of Minnett and Co, St Mary st, Ross

Walker, William Henry, Moss Side, nr Manchester, Commission Agent. May 9 at 3 at offices of Farrington, Princess st, Manchester

Whalley, John, Moss Side, nr Manchester, Builder. May 9 at 3 at offices of Fox, Princess st, Manchester

White, Edward Hubert, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Coach Builder. May 14 at 2 at offices of Hughes and Co, Budge row

White, John, Birmingham, Fruit Salesman. May 8 at 12 at offices of Maher, Upper Temple st, Birmingham

Whitfield, Robert, Foul-on-le-Eyde, Lancashire, Grocer. May 12 at 3 at offices of Blackhurst, Lytham st, Blackpool

Wilson, Thomas, Dudley hill, Bradford, Contractor. May 12 at 3.30 at offices of Neill, Kirkgate, Bradford

Wright, Thomas, London Wall, Fishmonger. May 13 at 3 at offices of Bath and Son, St Benets place, Gracechurch st. Philby, Fenchurch buildings

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA & LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,
H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, BLOOMSBURY

(Immediately opposite the British Museum).

Will be glad to forward his new Pamphlet gratis and post-free, which explains the only perfectly painless system of adapting ARTIFICIAL TEETH (protected by Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent), which have obtained five Prize Medals, London 1862, Paris 1867, Philadelphia 1876, Vienna 1873, and New York 1853.—Consultation daily free.

EVISON & BRIDGE,

22, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON,

Law Stationers,
Printers, and Publishers of Law
Forms,

Have all the new Forms required by the Judicature Acts.

ALSO A GREAT VARIETY OF

BANKRUPTCY,
CONVEYANCING,

PROBATE, and
GENERAL FORMS.

Where 100 copies of any form ordered, the solicitor's name, address, &c., inserted without extra charge.
Statements, Affidavits, &c., printed in correct style with expedition and accuracy.

EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c
ESTABLISHED 1689.

94. CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

AN IMPORTANT CONVENIENCE TO LAW WRITERS AND
SOLICITORS.

STEPHENS' SCARLET INK FOR STEEL PENS.

This new Ink supplies the demand continually made but never before met, for a Red Ink which is unaltered by Steel or other Metallic Pens. Steel Pens left in this ink for months do not impair the tenacity of its colour, nor are the Pens in the least corroded by it. The existing Red Inks rapidly destroy Steel Pens, and lose their red colour if used with other than Gold or Quill Pens. This new colour is a very rich scarlet red of great beauty. The colour of this ink is not affected by use upon parchment, and is consequently of great value to Solicitors and Draughtsmen.

Sold in stone bottles, retail at 1s., 2s., 3s.; and Imperial Quarts of 40 ounces at 6s. each. Also in glass bottles at 6d. and 1s. each.

WANTED, a Re-engagement as a General Clerk in a Solicitor's Office. Upwards of fifteen years' experience, including Poor Law Union Work. Good testimonials.—Address, C. B., 15, Banks Town, Sheerness.

LAW.—Accountant and Bill Clerk.—An experienced Clerk desires a Re-Engagement as above.—J. F., 7, Markham-square, Chelsea, S.W.

LAW.—Conveyancing Managing Clerkship required by a Gentleman of experience, able to conduct without supervision.—Address, W., Mr. Clements, 2, Alice Villas, White Hart-lane Wood Green, N.

LAW COSTS, in all Departments, prepared for Taxation or Delivery by a Practical Draughtsman of 27 years' experience. Taxations attended. Arrears made up, in town or country. Terms strictly moderate.—T. N. WOOTTON, 25, Clapton-square.

LAW EXAMINATIONS.—MR. ALBERT ST. PAUL (M.A. Oxon), Solicitor, prepares gentlemen for their Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final Examinations, either privately, or in class. Resident pupils received.—Address, 11, Staple-inn, London, W.C.

MR. T. BATEMAN NAPIER, CLIFFORD'S-INN PRIZEMAN, Winner of the Law Society's ONLY SCHOLARSHIP, and CONVEYANCING GOLD MEDALIST, 1876, reads with Gentlemen for the PRELIMINARY, INTERMEDIATE, and FINAL, and for the BAR Examinations. Private Pupils. Honour Class taken separately.
Students prepared through the post.

1, MITRE COURT BUILDINGS, KING'S BENCH WALK, TEMPLE, E.C.

10 SOLICITORS.—No. 31, Lincoln's-inn-fields to be Let on Lease for 31 years to any large firm requiring 15 rooms. It will not be let in chambers.—Apply to F. EILGART, Surveyor and Auctioneer, 40, Chancery-lane, W.C.

